POST RĀMĀNUJA WRITER'S SERIES

PĀRĀŚARA BHAṬṬA

HIS CONTRIBUTION TO VIŚIṢṬĀDVAITA

Dr S. PADMANABHAN
Department of Sanskrit
University of Madras
Madras

Publisher

SRI VISHISHTADVAITA RESEARCH CENTRE

66, Dr. Rangachari Road, Madras-600 018

1995

First Edition 1995

This book is published with the financial assistance from T.T.D. under the scheme aid to publish religious books.

Laser Typeset and Printed by:
V.K.N. ENTERPRISES
8/1, Dr. Rangachari Road, Madras-4

FOREWORD

I have very great pleasure in acceding to the desire of my colleague and student Dr S. Padmanabhan to write a foreword to the printed version of his doctoral thesis on the Life and works of Śrī Parāśara Bhaṭṭa.

Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is one of the key figures in the evolution of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school of thought and one of the most distinguished preceptors in the **guruparaṁparā** of this school. Although one may say of this school that it is more theological than philosophical in the thought content of its preceptors, yet one has to reckon with the fact that in the Indian Philosophical tradition, the goal of philosophical speculation is to be attained through religious observance.

In the evolution of the great school of Viśiṣṭādvaita, the moving hymns of the Āḷvārs played a notable role. The adoration of the Lord in all His numerous manifestations filled the Āḷvārs with an awesome intensity of joy. One can imagine the fervour of their contemplation of the Lord and their eagerness to have the profoundest experience of Him as the goal of all living and being in this world. Śrī Raṅganātha Muni, Rāmānuja, — Yāmunācārya, Parāśara and Vedānta Deśika to name only a few of the celebrated founders and speculative thinkers of this school—

devotion to whom is the purpose of existence and the means of salvation.

The study of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa's available works — both original and expository that Dr Padmanabhan has given us in this work is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the thought and achievement of this great figure in the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. This work shows earnestness, profound understanding and scholarly integrity on the part of the author and it has an easy style which makes for pleasant reading.

I commend the scholar for giving us this extremely useful study of the numerous works of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa.

Dr N. VEEZHINATHAN

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

Śrī Parāśara Bhaṭṭa was an important and distinguished writer and preceptor of the post-Rāmānuja and pre-Vedānta Deśika period of the Viśiṣṭādvaita Philosophy. He was the son of the celebrated Śrī Kūrattāḻvān a close associate of Śrī Rāmānuja. It is well-known in tradition that it was Kūrattāḻvān, the author of Pañcastava, who helped Śrī Rāmānuja in writing the Śrībhāṣya. Following his father Parāśrā Bhaṭṭa too wrote many works for the development and propagation of this glorious tradition.

Though many of the works of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa were often printed yet no systematic effort was made to study the available works of Parāśra Bhaṭṭa collectively. This long - felt need is satisfied now by the present writer Dr Padmanabhan.

A close study of this work would reveal many facets about the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition of thought. The characteristics of a Śrīvaiṣṇava, his devotion to the ācārya and Supreme lord and other details are well brought out in this work. Many interesting details regarding the life and date of Parāśara are recorded faithfully. The stotra-s of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa are marvellous pieces of lyrical poetry with philosophical import. The **Tattvaratnākara**- fragments point out Parāśara as a master dialectician of the pre-Vedānta

Deśika period. The Viṣṇu- sahasranāmabhāṣya of Bhaṭṭar brings out the importance of the Bhāgavata cult and the glorious and innumerable auspicious qualities of the Supreme Lord.

The Viśiṣṭādvaita Research Centre has dedicated itself for the noble task of the propagation and publication of the work of the ancient as well as modern writers. Many such books have already been published by the centre. We are pleased to add one more - the present book by Dr Padmanabhan to that list of publications to the learned readers.

(S.V.S. RAGHAVAN)
Chairman
VISHISHTADVAITA RESEARCH CENTRE
MADRAS.

PREFACE

Parāśara Bhaṭṭa occupies a pre-eminent position among the Śrīnivasaṇava-ācārya-s belonging to the post-Rāmānuja period. As a matter of fact he was a younger contemporary of Śri Rāmānuja (11th cent. A.D.) and was the son of Kūrattālvān, Rāmānuja's foremost disciple. According to one tradition Parāśara was also the spiritual successor of Rāmānuja.

The contributions of Rāmānuja and his predecessor Yāmuna to Viśiṣṭādvaita have received the attention of scholars. The post-Parāśara polymath Vedāanta Deśika and his works have also been attracting scholars from time to time. One of the great predecessors of Vedānta Desīka who considerably influenced his thinking was Parāśara. Dr. G. Oberhammer of Vienna University (Austria) made an analysis of the fragments from Parāśara's **Tattvaratnākara** which are preserved in Vedānta Deśika's works. Parāśara's **stotra**--s have also been published with Tamil explanation by Sri P.B. Annangaracharya Svamin of Kanchipuram. The **Aṣṭaślokī** and **Viṣṇu-sahasranāmabhāṣya** of Parāśara have also been published with English translation and explanatory notes by Sri T. Bheemacharya and Prof. A. Srinivasaaghavan respectively. The commentary on the **Tiruneḍuntāṇṭaka** stanza and the **Tirumanjana-kavi**--s are also published. Still no attempt has so far been made to study all the available works of Parāsara in a synthesize manner with a view to evaluate his contribution to the growth and development of the Śrivaiṣṇava religion and philosophy, which is now known as the Viśiṣṭādvaita.

The present book is a humble effort to fill in this gap.

It is now my plesant duty to thank all who helped me to prepare this book. I wish to express my sincere and grateful thanks to Dr M. Narasimhacharya, Professor and Head of the Department of Vaishnavism, University of Madras, for having suggested this topic and guided me at every stage. But for his valuable guidance, this book could not have taken this form.

I am extremly thankful to Dr N. Veezhinathan, Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras for his kind help, encouragement and to the foreword. My thanks are due to the authorities of the University of Madras for permitting me to carry on the research in the Department of Sanskrit.

I am grateful to the Vishishtadvaita Research Centre and particularly to Sri S.V.S. Raghavan who gave the consent to publish the book through the Centre by readily giving his foreword.

My sincere thanks are due to my friend Sri L. Kumaraswamy who helped me in preparing the Appendices, and to Dr V.K.S.N. Raghavan, Professor, Dept. of Vaishvasism, University f Madras for going through the proof material.

I thank Mr. S. Babu Rajendran, Assistant Section Officer Department of Sanskrit, for typing out the manuscript neatly.

Madras **(S. PADMANABHAN)**

ABBREVIATIONS

N.C.C.	-	New Catalogus Catalogorum
N.P.	-	Nyāyapariśuddhi
N.S.	-	Nyāyasiddhāñjana
R.T.S.	-	Rahasyatrayasāra
SGRK	-	Śrīguṇaratnakośa
SRJS	-	Śrīraṅgarājastava
TMK	-	Tattvamuktākalāpa
VSB	-	Śrīviṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya
YMD	-	Yatīndramatadīpikā

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ŚRĪ PARĀŚARA BHAṬṬA - HIS LIFE AND DATE

All systems of philosophy bearing upon Vedic authority draw their inspiration from the triple canonvical texts (*prasthānatraya*), namely, the *Upaniṣad*-s, the *Brahma-sūtra*-s and the *Bhagavad-gītā.* Teachers like Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and Rāmānuja and others interpreted these texts in accordance with their own systems of philosophy. As is well-known, the Viśiṣṭādvaita system which owes its inspiration and authority to the works of earlier mystic saints like Nammāḷvār and Tirumaṅgai Āḷvār, and teachers like Nāthamuni (C. 9th century) and Yāmunācārya (A.D. 918-1038) received a systematic exposition and canonical interpretation from the great Rāmānujācārya (A.D. 1017-1137). The name - Viśiṣṭādvaita is to be understood as the name of a system which recognizes the "oneness" of the Supreme Being who is qualified by the gross and subtle forms of the sentient and insentient entities, at the two states of the manifestation and dissolution of the universe.[1] The concept that the Lord is the Soul and that the world of men and matter constitutes His body, has become one of the cardinal tenets of this school.[2] This system from the religious standpoint is known as Śrīvaiṣṇavism. This term suggests the importance of Śrī or Lakṣmī in this school as the mother of entire creation and as the inseparable and ever approachable, compassionate and bountiful consort of the Lord. It is also to be noted that Viśiṣṭādvaita can be appreciated not merely as a system of philosophy but as a synthetic and integrated

school of religious philosophy. The circumstances under which this school originated and developed, and its liberal catholicism as can be seen from the life-accounts of Rāmānuja and his successors, are quite well known. Scholars opine that this system came into being in response to the popular demand and as a solution to the day-to-day problems of the common man.[3]

Another important aspect of the Śrīvaiṣṇava school of thought is that it relies upon the authority of the Tamil compositions of the God-intoxicated saints called Āḷvār-s whose inspired utterances are traditionally recorded and handed down under the name *Divyaprabandha,* running to almost 4,000 in number. Another stream of tradition that has made this system a real *triveṇī* is the *Āgama* tradition with its two-fold division as *Pāñcarātra* and *Vaikhānasa.* Inheriting this inspiring revelation and tradition and combining his own intuition, Rāmānuja built up a meaningful system which in later years became a symbol of great authority and developed a vast literature, offering great solace to the layman tormented and tortured by the trammels of the worldly life.[4]

As already stated, Nāthamuni was the first *Śrīvaiṣṇava* teacher of South India. His two works, the *Nyāyatattva* and the *Yogarahasya* are lost to posterity for all practical purposes. However, some passages of the *Nyāyatattva* culled from different sources have already been studied by scholars.[5]

Yāmunācārya, his grandson, known under the popular name Āḷavandār, is the next important teacher of this school.[6] He wrote six works bearing upon the Vedic authority and Āgamic validity. His *Āgamaprāmāṇya* establishes the authority of the *Pāñcarātrāgama*-s. He

wrote the *Siddhitraya* in three sections called *Ātma-siddhi, Īśvara-siddhi* and *Saṁvit-siddhi* dealing with the essential nature of the Individual Self, the Lord and knowledge respectively. His *Gītārthasaṁgraha* is an epitome of the *Bhagavadgītā* in thirty-two verses incorporating the traditional interpretation of the *Gītā* which he received from his own teacher, Śrīrāmamiśra. The *Catuśślokī* in four verses discusses the nature of Lakṣmī and her position in this system. The *Stotraratna* is a masterly lyric of poetic grandeur glorifying the Lord in His heavenly abode and focusing His unconditional grace which is the redemptive factor in the life of suffering humanity. Yāmuna is said to have written the *Puruṣanirṇaya* also, which is lost to us. It must have been in existence at the time of Vedānta Deśika (13th century A.D.) since he refers to it in some of his works.

Yāmunācārya was succeeded by Śrī Rāmānuja, the most important exponent of Viśiṣṭādvaita. He wrote nine works and made an invaluable contribution to the Viśiṣṭādvaita *Vedānta.* His *Śrībhāṣya* is an extensive commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*-s of Bādarāyaṇa. In his *Vedārthasaṁgraha,* Rāmānuja synthesises the conflicting passages of the *Upaniṣad*-s in contradistinction to the other schools of thought. His *Vedāntadīpa* and *Vedāntasāra* are the shorter versions of his own commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*-s, that is, the *Śrībhāṣya.* His *Gadyatraya* comprising *Śaraṇāgati, Śrīraṅga* and *Vaikuṇṭha-gadya*-s explains the concept of whole-hearted surrender called *Śaraṇāgati* according to this system, the glory of Lord Raṅganātha, the presiding deity at Śrīraṅgam (Tamilnadu) and the highest abode of the Lord, Śrīvaikuṇṭha. In his *Nityagrantha,* Rāmānuja explains the daily routine to be observed by a Śrīvaiṣṇava.

The first and foremost among the disciples of Śrī Rāmānuja was Śrīvatsāṅkamiśra also known as Śrīvatsacihna, Kūreśa, Kūranātha and Kūrattāḻvān. The first two names indicate that he was originally called by a synonym of Viṣṇu. The rest of the names suggest that he was the 'lord' or an important person from the village Kūram near Kāñcīpuram in Tamilnadu. Hagiological works state that he faced the fury of the Coḷa King, Kulottuṅga I for the sake of his master and lost his eyes. Traditional works like the *Divyasūricarita* and *Prapannāmṛta* state that Kūreśa was very close to Rāmānuja and was extremely helpful to his master in composing the *Śrībhāṣya.* Kūreśa was the author of five lyrics of exquisite charm. They are the *Atimānuṣastava,* the *Sundarabāhustava,* the *Varadarājastava,* the *Vaikuṇṭhastava* and the *Śrīstava.* He is the second Śrīvaiṣṇava teacher to compose lyrics in praise of the Lord, Yāmuna being the first to do so.

Śrī Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, the son of Kurattāḻvān and Āṇḍāḷ, is an important Śrīvaiṣṇava teacher whose contribution to Viśiṣṭādvaita is the subject of the present study. He is said to be the next spiritual leader after Rāmānuja's demise in A.D. 1137. Another popular view is that Tirukkurukaippirānpiḷḷān was the immediate spiritual successor of Rāmānuja.[8] According to works on hagiology Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, henceforth to be referred to as Parāśara was born as a result of the grace of Lord Raṅganātha.[9] He was the elder one of the twins born to his mother. It is also stated that to perpetuate the memory of Parāśara, the author of *Viṣṇupurāṇa,* this child was named Parāśara Bhaṭṭa and the other child as Vedavyāsa Bhaṭṭa, by Śrī Rāmānuja himself.[10] Since Parāśara was also officiating as the chief priest and expounding the *purāṇa*-s in the Śrīraṅgam temple, he was also named as the *purohita*

of Lord Śrīraṅganātha (*Śrīraṅgeśa-purohitaḥ*).[11] As a youth he is said to have defeated a famous Advaita teacher Mādhavadāsa of Melkote (Tirunārāyaṇapuram). It is stated that the scholarly duel went on for a week and that finally Mādhavadāsa accepted his defeat and becme a disciple of Parāśara under a new name Raṅganātha, consequent to his conversion of Śrīvaiṣṇavism. Raṅganātha is popularly known as Nañjīyar in Tamil and is the celebrated commentator on the *Śrīsūkta* and also on the *Tiruvāymoḷi* of Nammāḷvār. It is said that he wrote the commentary on the *Tiruvāymoḷi* at the instance of Parāśara. The elaborate commentary *Īḍu* on the *Tiruvāymoḷi* is replete with several instances of how Parāśara interpreted and explained (*nirvāha*-s) some of the knotty passages of the *Tiruvāymoḷi* in accordance with the spirit of the school.

DATE OF PARĀŚARA BHAṬṬA

The date of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is a moot point. While there is unanimity in accepting him as a spiritual teacher after Rāmānuja's demise in A.D. 1137, the exact date of his birth could not be decided. The traditional records give the month and the day of his birth as *Vṛṣabhamāsa* and *Anūrādhānakṣatra,* but do not mention the year. Naturally scholars have proposed different years corresponding to the birth of Parāśara. One such date of Parāśara's birth is A.D. 1062.[12] According to some, however, this varies from A.D. 1073 to 1078.[14] The *Guruparamparā* of Brahmatantra-svatantra-svāmin III (A.D. 15th cent.) gives *Śubhakṛt* as the year of his birth in *Kali* 4163.[15] This corresponds to Friday the 24th May of A.D. 1062.[16] Another tradition gives the date of Parāśara's demise as *Śukla Dvādaśī* in the *Jaya* year.[17] This corresponds to Wednesday, 11th November,

A.D. 1114.[18] But how far this traditional date is reliable is yet to be proved, for tradition says that Parāśara lived only for about 30 years.[19]

In order to arrive at the approximate date of Parāśara, we have to rely upon the chronology of incidents that took place during the life-time of Rāmānuja and Parāśara. History avers that due to the persecution by the Coḷa king Kulottuṅga I, Rāmānuja moved to Melkote (in the modern Karnataka State). There he converted the Hoyasla king Biṭṭi Deva from Jainism to Śrīvaiṣṇavism and gave him the new name Viṣṇuvardhana. According to the *Guruparamparāprabhāva* the Coḷa persecution took place after the marriage of Parāśara[20] and the year of this Coḷa persecution is given as A.D. 1098.[21] Tradition avers that Rāmānuja was in exile for 14 to 16 years. The conversion of the Hoyasala King took place in A.D. 1116.[22] So it appears that Rāmānuja might have moved to Melkote only at the beginning of the 12th century.

According to the *Guruparamparāprabhāva,* Parāśara got initiated into the sacred lore after his *upanayana* (sacred-thread investiture ceremony) at the right age. It was the practice in ancient India to have this sacred initiation at the age of eight.[23] Parāśara had his education for sometime and then he got married to a girl - Akkacci by name.[24] Although in some genealogical charts preserved in some ancient families we find a son was born to Parāśara under the name Madhya-pratolī-Bhaṭṭārya, we have no authentic record corroborating this point.[25] At the time of his marriage Parāśara must have been at least 15 years old and the marriage should have taken place towards the end of 11th century or at the beginning of the 12th century. This gives the year of birth of Parāśara around A.D. 1085 to A.D. 1090.

According to the same traditional account there was a difference of opinion betweeen Parāśara and the then King Vīrasundara. It is stated that Parāśara objected to he King's demolishing the house of a Vaiṣṇava to raise he outer wall of the Śrīraṅgam temple. As a result Parāśara ncurred the displeasure of the king and had to live at Tirukkoṭṭiyūr in the district of Pudukkottai in Tamilnadu. t is also stated that he returned to Śrīraṅgam only after Vīrasundara's death.[26] However there is no historical evidence to show that there existed a king by the name Vīrasundara during this period. Yet this Vīrasundara may be one of the several titles of the contemporary King Rājarāja II or he might have been a vassal of the Coḷa King Rājarāja II. Parāśara returned to Śrīraṅgam from Tirukkoṭṭiyūr after Vīrasundara's demise and continued o live for some time and then was followed by Nañjīyar, s his spiritual successor.

It is safe to conclude, therefore, that Parāśara might ave lived upto 60 or 70 years taking into consideration he facts mentioned above concerning his parentage and piritual authority invested in him by Śrī Rāmānuja.

CHAPTER II

THE WORKS OF PARĀŚARA BHAṬṬA - A BRIEF ANALYSIS

Parāśara Bhaṭṭa who is thus reputed to have been a great successor of Rāmānuja was a prolific writer of great distinction. All his works-in Sanskrit or in Tamil-bear the impress of his amazing scholarship and unquestionable command of the language concerned. He wrote twelve works - ten in Sanskrit and two in Tamil apart from a good number of stray verses in Sanskrit. He is also credited with several original interesting elucidations and interpretations of some passages of *Divyaprabandha* which are popular in the learned traditional circles as *nirvāha*-s. Of the Sanskrit works only six are available in full and all of them are printed. They are: the *Aṣṭaślokī,* the *Kriyādīpa,* ·the *Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa (Viṣṇu-sahasra nāmabhāṣya),* the *Śrīguṇaratnakośa,* the *Śrīraṅganātha stotra* and the *Śrīraṅgarājastava.* His three other Sanskrit works, namely, the *Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvaya-vivaraṇa,* or *Vyākhyā,* the *Tattvaratnākara* and the *Lakṣmīkalyāṇa nāṭaka* are available only in a few fragments preserved in the quotations of Vedānta Deśika. Parāśara's another work, the *Subālopaniṣad-vivaraṇa* is quoted for once by Nṛsiṁhadeva in his commentary *Ānandadāyinī* on the *Sarvārthasiddhi* which is an auto-commentary by Vedānta Deśika on his *Tattvamuktākalāpa.* Of his Tamil compositions, the *Kaiśikapurāṇa,* also known as Kaiśika-māhātmya is available in print. His elaborate commentary on a particular stanza - *Maivaṇṇanarunguñji* forming part of the celebrated Tamil work *Tiruneḍuntāṇṭakam* of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār, which itself forms part of the second thousand of the *Divyaprabandha* is also available in print.[2] As for the *muktaka*-s (stray

verses) mentioned earlier, they are recited on different occasions and form part of an unbroken living tradition in the South Indian Śrīvaiṣṇava temple liturgies. There is also a eulogy, called *Goṣṭhīstava* attributed to our author. As the name suggests, it is in praise of Tirukkoṭṭiyūr, a pilgrim town in the Pudukkoṭṭai District of Tamilnadu. In Sanskrit this place is called *Goṣṭhīpurī.* This hymn is in ten verses of which the first and the last describe the presiding deity called *Saumya-nārāyaṇa.* Verses 2 to 9 describe the town in terms of its scenic beauty, sanctity and the river called *Maṇimuttāṟu.* Other points of interest mentioned by the author are that the Tamil Saint Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār sang in praise of this deity and that Rāmānuja used to visit this place quite often to meet his preceptor Goṣṭhipūrṇa. However, this work does not appear to have been written by Parāśara. The *stotra* seems to end abruptly; the style also does not commend itself as that of Parāśara. But for the opening dedicatory stanza (called *Tanian* in Tamil) which runs thus -

śrīparāśara-bhaṭṭāryaḥ śrīraṅgeśa-purohitaḥ
śrīvatsāṅkasutaḥ śrīmān śreyase me'stu bhūyase

there is no other evidence that it is the work of Parāśara.

Given below is a brief account of all the available works of Parāśara:

1) AṢṬAŚLOKĪ

As the very name indicates this work is in eight verses. Marked by brevity and clarity, this explains the essence of the three important secrets of the Śrīvaiṣṇava religion and philosophy, namely, the *aṣṭākṣara,* the *dvaya*

mantra—Oṁ namo nārāyaṇāya, held in very high esteem by a Śrīvaiṣṇava. It is to be repeated every day along with the *dvayamantra. 'Dvaya'* means a pair and this is the name given to the *mantra* with six *padas* (words), namely *'śrīmannārāyaṇa-caraṇau śaraṇam prapadye, śrīmate nārāyaṇāya namaḥ'.* This expression brings out the total surrender of the devotee to the lotus-feet of Lord Nārayaṇa who forms the Supreme Godhead along with His consort Śrī. As for the *caramaśloka* the verse *sarvadharmān,* etc., of the *Bhagavadgītā* (18-66) is of great importance to the Śrīvaiṣṇava-s- since according to them, it pinpoints wholehearted surrender as the effective means of salvation.

Parāśara's *Aṣṭaślokī,* couched in such long metres as *Śikhariṇī, Śārdūlavikrīḍita* and *Śragdharā* very effectively brings out the importance of these three secrets which form part of the daily recitation and routine of an orthodox Śrīvaiṣṇava. The first four verses are devoted to the explanation of the *aṣṭākṣara,* the next two expound the *dvaya* and the last two, the *Caramaśloka.*

(2) KRIYĀDĪPA

Strictly speaking this work appears to be an ascription, although tradition believes it to have been certainly composed by Parāśara. That it might have been composed by someone and fathered upon Parāśara cannot be ruled out. This is so because Vedānta Deśika in his *Rahasyatrayasāra* quotes the following three verses as from the *Nityagrantha* of Parāśara (*Bhaṭṭar nityam*):

"praṇavodita - taccheṣabhāvo'haṁ nijakarmabhiḥ
ahaṁkāra - mamatvābhyāmabhibhūto'pyataḥ paraṁ
taccheṣatvānusandhānapūrva-tacchesavṛttikaḥ
bhūyāsamityamuṁ bhāvaṁ vyanakti nama ityadaḥ

śrutismṛtyuditaṁ karma yāvacchakti parātmanaḥ ārādhanatvenāpādya sordhvapuṇḍraśca tarpayet".[3]

Further the seventy-two verses of the extant text do not show anything new or interesting since the *Nityagrantha* of Rāmānuja composed a little before Parāśara's work had already been popular with the devout Śrīvaiṣṇava-s in the performance of their daily religious rites. However it appears that every spiritual teacher of those days was obliged to compose one *nitya-grantha* (routine manual) for the benefit of his own disciples and followers. As such, one cannot rule out the possibility of Parāśara's composing a *nitya-grantha* for the benefit of his own followers too. But the point on hand is that the text referred to by Vedānta Deśika as the *Nitya-grantha* of Parāśara seems to be different from the one available to us as the *Kriyādīpa* of Parāśara. The work called *Āhnika-grantha* compiled by one Śrīraṅganātha-yatīndra-mahādeśika, the twenty-sixth head of the pontifical chair of the Ahobilamath (early part of the 19th century) refers to the work of Parāśara as having been consulted for its composition. However no quotation from *Kriyādīpa* is fòund in this *Āhnikagrantha.*[4]

(3) THE BHAGAVADGUṆADARPAṆA

This is the name of Parāśara's masterly commentary on the *Viṣṇusahasranāma* which forms part of the *Anuśāsanaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata.* It has to be mentioned that of all the available works of Parāśara this is the only one written in prose. It appears that Parāśara wrote it in contradistinction to Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Viṣṇusahasranāma,* which was obviously written from the Advaitic standpoint. In his

efficacy and popularity of this *stotra* and then explains at length the *tattva* (reality or truth), *hita* (means) and *puruṣārtha* (the human end) according to the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. True to the Śrīvaiṣṇava concept, the author brings out the glory of the Supreme Lord as *saguṇa* (with qualities). He also discusses other important tenets of this school such as the body-soul relation (*śarīra-ātma-bhāva*) between the world and the Lord, the state of release, the supremacy of the Lord and His inseparable relation with Śrī, His consort. Another noteworthy feature of this commentary is that it quotes profusely not only from the *Upaniṣad*-s and Epics but also from the *Pāñcarātra* texts such as the *Sātvata*, and the *Pauṣkara Saṁhitā*-s and from a number of *Purāṇa*-s like the *Viṣṇu, Bhāgavata* and *Varāha.*

(4) ŚRĪGUṆARATNAKOŚA

This is an elegant hymn addressed to Goddess Śrī comprising sixty-one stanzas.[5] Parāśara identifies Goddess Śrī with Sītā and identifies her again with Śrīraṅganāyakī the presiding deity at Śrīraṅgam. He describes Śrī not as an elderly matron, not even as a maiden who has attained efflorescence but as an adolescent girl who is just in the confluence of childhood and fresh youth, called by Parāśara *Śaiśavayauvana-vyatikara.* Another striking feature of this hymn is that Parāśara views Lakṣmī not only as the presiding deity of prosperity and plenty, but also as one who can bless her devotees with remarkable powers of speech, the art of poesy in particular, through her mere glance. This is one of the finest devotional lyrics in the literature of Śrīvaiṣṇava *stotra-s,* kept in the tradition of day-to-day chanting (*pārāyaṇa*) of a devout Śrīvaiṣṇava. Parāśara traces the concept of Śrī to the

the glory of Lord Viṣṇu is dependent upon that of His consort. Rising to supreme heights of poetic charm the author describes Lakṣmī as responsible even for the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe, inspiring Her Lord to carry out these cosmic functions. The graphic descriptions in which the poet excels in presenting the glorious picture of Lakṣmī as the presiding deity of plenty, prosperity and exquisite charm are matched by his vivid portrayal of the same Goddess as the considerate and compassionate mother of all beings full of the milk of human kindness. Perhaps the concept of Lakṣmī's mediacy (*puruṣakāra*) between God and men owes much to this picture of Lakṣmī drawn by the author. Drawing profusely from the episode of Sītā in the *Rāmāyaṇa,* Parāśara justifies the motherhood of Lakṣmī in what may be called the dramatic style of engaging her Lord in a lively and lovely conversation, pacifying the anger of Her Lord and assuaging the fear of the errant child.

(5) ŚRĪRAṄGANĀTHA STOTRA

Another beautiful lyric from the pen of Parāśara is the *Śrīraṅganāthastotra* in six verses. All the printed versions of this *stotra* contain eight verses. Scholars are of the opinion that the last two are stray verses (*muktaka*), which are taken together along with the first six and chanted among the traditional circles.[6] Known for its candid and clear style this brings out the pangs experienced by an ardent devotee when separated from his chosen deity. Every verse describes the feelings of the poet yearning for his daily ablutions in the river *Kāverī,* for worshipping Lord Raṅganātha, for repeating his holy names and such devotional activities. This *stotra* again is in the tradition of daily repetition of an ardent Śrīvaiṣṇava.

Tradition avers that Parāśara composed this *stotra* when he had to go away from Śrīraṅgam due to the displeasure he incurred of the then Coḷa king Vīrasundara.[7]

(6) ŚRĪRAṄGARĀJASTAVA

This is the longest and the most important *stotra* composed by Parāśara. It contains 232 verses and is divided into two sections called the *Pūrvaśataka* the earlier hundred verses and the *Uttaraśataka* - the subsequent hundred verses. The first section deals at length with the glory of Lord Raṅganātha whom our author calls Raṅgarāja, the Emperor or Ruler of Śrīraṅgam. The *Śrīvaiṣṇava-āgama*-s, it may be noted in this context, state that the Supreme Being should be honoured as an emperor.[8] True to this tradition Parāśara gives a grand description of Raṅganātha - the presiding deity of Śrīraṅgam, whom he identifies with Lord Viṣṇu the Supreme Being sung in the sacred literature. Of special mention are the Lord's innumerable perfections of which compassion is of utmost significance to the devotee. The author also provides a very beautiful description of the temple of Śrīraṅgam, its environs, the *Kāverī,* the gardens surrounding the temple and so on.

In contradistinction to the *Pūrvaśataka,* the *Uttaraśataka* concerns itself with several issues such as the supremacy of the Lord, the claims of the other schools of thought regarding the purport of the Upaniṣadic texts, the nature of *mokṣa* and the like. Parāśara, a relentless critic of other schools of thought can be seen in this piece of poetry as an uncompromising champion of the cause of the Śrivaiṣṇava school. It may be pointed out in this connection that Parāśara is following the example of his illustrious father Śrīvatsāṅka Miśra, who had also earlier

philosophical disquisitions and criticisms of other schools, while glorifying certain deities of his own choice. In fact Yāmuna himself has started this technique of clothing philosophical ideas and criticism of other schools in the garb of lyric poetry[9] in the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition.

7. OTHER WORKS OF PARĀŚARA

f Of the lost works of Parāśara, the most important is perhaps the *Tattvaratnākara.* About 42 fragments of this masterly treatise on *tattva* (the Reality) are available now exclusively through the quotations by Vedānta Deśika. Composed in mixed prose and verse the *Tattvaratnākara* appears to have been an ocean (*ratnākara*) of several philosophical concepts of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. Although a clear picture of the plan of this work cannot be obtained due to the incomplete nature of these quotations, it is still possible to hold that it was a large work divided into several chapters called *prakaraṇa*-s subdivided into several sections called *pāda*-s. The *Nyāyapariśuddhi* of Vedānta Deśika, it may be said, closely follows this work of Parāśara.

G. Oberhammer is of the opinion that the *Tattvaratnākara* was never completed by the author and that even Vedānta Deśika might not have known the fuller text.[10] While tracing the possible reasons for the loss of the *Tattvaratnākara,* he states that the political conditions during the 12th century might have been one such cause. Or the popularity of the works of earlier Ācārya-s like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja and especially that of Rāmānuja's *Śrībhāṣya* might have led to the comparative neglect of the *Tattvaratnākara.* Another reason, according to the same scholar, could have been that Parāśara's theology foreshadowed the doctrine of the Teṉkalai school and so naturally was not favoured by the other group, namely, the Vaḍakalai school.[11] It

remains to be observed that it is very difficult to posit any particular reason for the loss of texts in ancient India. Apart from the reasons mentioned by Oberhammer, it might also be stated that sheer ravages of time, accidents and lack of facilities for the preservation of manuscripts could have contributed to the loss of this monumental work of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa.

The *Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvaya Vivaraṇa* has come down to us only in the form of two quotations found in the *Nyāya-siddhāñjana.* The first quotation is concerned with the definition of *śarīra* (the body) given in the *Śrībhāṣya* of Rāmānuja.[12] Introducing this quotation Vedānta Deśika says that some take Rāmānuja's statement as forming a single definition whereas, others hold it as comprising three definitions. Deśika further says that Parāśara Bhaṭṭa in his *Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvaya-vivaraṇa* shows his favour towards the view which holds that this definition contains in itself three definitions. That is to say that both the sentient and insentient beings form the body of the Lord by virtue of their being controlled by the Lord, being supported by Him and by virtue of their being sub-servient to the Lord. The same definition holds good for any physical body.[13]

Another quotation from the *Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvaya-vivaraṇa* found in the *Nyāyasiddhāñjana* mentions the similarity between *aiśvarya* (lordship) and *akṣara (kaivalya)* - both of which are different from liberation (*mokṣa*) which is the highest state of bliss.[14] In other words *aiśvarya* is only the joy of experiencing material objects; *akṣara* which is another name for *kaivalya* is the bliss resulting from experiencing one's own self. These two are two different degrees of joy. *Mokṣa* which constitutes the supreme bliss is therefore superior to both *akṣara* and *aiśvarya.*

The *Lakṣmikalyāṇa,* another work of Parāśara, known only through three quotations is known to tradition as a *nāṭaka.*[15] Vedānta Deśika is the only author to quote a few lines of this work in his *Sārasāra,* which forms a part of the *Sillarairahasyaṅgaḷ,* in his *Gītā-bhāṣya-tātparyacandrikā* and in his *Rahasyatrayasāra.* The *Siddhopāyacodana*-section of the *Rahasyatrayasāra* refers to the expression, *ananyādhīnakalyāṇam* which is a part of the *anuṣṭubh* verse known to tradition as follows:

ananyādhīnakalyāṇam anyamaṅgalakāraṇam
jagannidānamadvandvaṁ dvandvaṁ vandāmahe vayam[16]

In all probability this could have been the *maṅgala-śloka* of this work. The short 'a' which is an auspicious symbol with which this verse opens and the benediction of the *namaskriyā*-type in conformity with tradition corroborates this point. It refers to the obeisance done by the poet to the divine pair (Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa) which is the source of the entire world-manifestation, which is unparalleled, whose glory is not dependent on any cause other than Itself and which, in turn, is at the very root of the auspiciousness, prosperity or glory of every other being (human or divine).

The other quotation of the *Lakṣmīkalyāṇa* is from the *Sārasāra* and it runs as follows:

svayaṁ vastūkurvan janamimam akasmāt sarasija-
prakārau padmāyāstava ca caraṇau naḥ śaraṇayān[17]

This statement appears to have been made by a devotee, addressing the Lord thus - "(O Lord!) you yourself have made this person (an indirect reference to the speaker himself) an existent being and out of motiveless grace made him (the speaker) whole-heartedly surrender at the lotus-feet of Lakṣmī and of your own self." It is

clear from these two lines forming a part of a verse couched in *śikhariṇī* metre, that the poet is referring to the motiveless and unconditional grace of Lord Viṣṇu. The care and concern the Lord has for the devotee are clear from the fact that He makes a man what he is by showing him the *upāya*, namely, doing *prapatti* first to Lakṣmī and then to Himself. Vedānta Deśika observes that Parāśara, by this statement is voicing the ideas expressed by Nammāḷvār in the line

āreṉakku niṉ pādamē śaraṇākattandoḷindāy[18]

The other quotation from this drama is found in the *Gītābhāṣyatātparyacandrikā* of Vedānta Deśika. Commenting on the word *daivam* of the *Gītā* text

daivaṁ caiva atra pañcamam[19]

he quotes the following as from the *Lakṣmīkalyāṇa:*

dharme pramāṇaṁ samayastadīyo
vedāśca tattvaṃ ca tadiṣṭadaivam.[20]

It appears from this half verse composed in the *indravajrā* metre that Parāśara is listing here the sources which can be taken as an authority in matters of *dharma.* According to him the tradition of meritorious people (*śiṣṭas*), the *Veda-s,* the ultimate truth and the deity chosen by such people form the *pramāṇa* in deciding matters concerning righteousness. But the point for which Vedānta Deśika quotes this passage is that the term *daivaṁ* used in the *Gītā* passage *daivam caivātra pañcamam* actually means *devatā* (a deity) but not fate or any other being though divine, lesser in importance than the supreme Being.[21]

It may be presumed, on the basis of these three quotations available, that Parāśara might have composed this drama taking the theme of Lakṣmī being married by Viṣṇu which ...

and other texts. It also appears to deal with some important concepts of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school such as *śaraṇāgati,* the position of Śrī and the supremacy of the dual divinity of Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa. It also, perhaps, deals with other issues like the means of ascertaining *dharma* and the question of one's chosen deity.

The next work, which is also lost to posterity is the commentary on the *Subālopaniṣad* which is generally referred to as *Vyākhyā* or *Vivaraṇa.* The quotation is as follows:

> *yaduktam bhaṭṭaparāśarapādair (śubālopaniṣad-vivaraṇe) - 'yadi bhūtānāmapi prakṛtitvaṁ tarhi aṣṭau prakṛtayaṣṣoḍaśa vikārāḥ iti śruteḥ kā gatiriti cet; vedopabṛṃhaṇanipuṇatara-paramarṣisandarśitaiva gatiḥ; nāsmābhistadviruddhanirvahaṇe' bhiniveṣṭavyam'.*[22]

Parāśara in his commentary on the *Śubālopaniṣad* raises the question as to how the scriptural passage speaking of eight *prakṛti*-s (primordial causes) and the sixteen modifications (*vikāra*-s) can be justified if even the elements (*bhūta*-s) are accepted as the primary causes (*prakṛti*). He answers this *prima facie* objection by stating that the great sage Vyāsa himself has shown the way out and as such no effort need be made by us in giving a different interpretation. The author of the *Ānandadāyinī,* quoting from the *Mokṣadharma* of the *Mahābhārata* explains that *avyakta, mahat* and *ahaṅkāra* and the five elements are the eight *prakṛti*-s in question. The five organs of knowledge and the five organs of action along with the five subtle forms of elements (*tanmātra*-s) and the mind form the sixteen *vikāra*-s.[23]

In fact the above quotation is given by the author of the *Ānandadāyinī* as the view anticipated by Vedānta Deśika in the *Sarvārthasiddhi* by the statement - *nanu upabṛṁhaṇaviśeṣānusārāt..,* etc.[24]

Of the Sanskrit works of Parāśara which remain to be enumerated are the *Muktaka*-s or stray verses (known as *Tirumañjana Kaṭṭiyaṅgal* or *Tirumañjana Kavis* in Tamil). These verses which are about 50 in number are recited in the Śrīraṅgam temple on occasions like *Ekādaśī, Amāvāsyā, Ayana,* Telugu and Tamil New Year days and *Brahmotsava.* Even today these verses are recited by the descendants of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa on the above occasions. Of these only 28 verses are available in print and the rest are with Bhaṭṭar's family at Śrīraṅgam.[25] One of these verses *tvaṁ me' haṁ me* received the attention of Vedānta Deśika.[26]

Of the Tamil compositions of Parāśara mention must be made of his commentary on the *Kaiśikapurāṇa (māhātmya)* forming part of the *Varāhapurāṇa* (Ch.48) which is held in high esteem by the Śrīvaiṣṇava-s.[27] Parāśara explains in Tamil the significance of singing the glory of the Lord at the *Brāhma-muhūrta* which is the main concern of this section of the *Varāhapurāṇa.* The original text contains 92 verses and is in the form of a dialogue between Lord Varāha and his consort Bhūmi. Tradition holds that Parāśara recited the *Kaiśikamāhātmya* on a particular day, that is, on the twelfth day of the bright fortnight in the Vṛścikamāsa (between Nov-Dec.) in the Śrīraṅgam temple and that he was accorded the rare honour of *Brahma-ratha* (being carried in a palanquin by Brāhmaṇas) for his remarkable way of recitation and interpretation which act won for him the grace of the Lord.[28] In his introduction to the commentary Parāśara points out that the *Purāṇa*-s which are meant to substantiate the teachings of the *Veda* can be divided as *sāttvika, rājasa* and *tāmasa* depending upon the preponderance of the qualities of *sattva* (serenity), *rajas* (activity) and *tamas* (inertia) respectively found in Lord

object of glorification in these *Purāṇa*-s. Since the quality of *sattva* is helpful to achieve *mokṣa* and since Lord Viṣṇu is popularly known to be the very embodiment of *sattva*, the *Purāṇa*-s which expound His glory are of primary importance for those who are interested in attaining salvation. Continuing, Parāśara points out that of all the incarnations Viṣṇu has taken such as Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Śrī Rāma and Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the Varāha incarnation is of great significance in matters concerning the *upāya* (means) of salvation.

Parāśara's commentary on a particular stanza of Thirumaṅgai Āḻvār's *Tiruneḍuntāṇḍakam* is an important landmark in the Śrīvaiṣṇava literature in Tamil. The stanza in question commences thus:

maivaṇṇanaṟuṅkuñji kuḻal..[29]

There is no exaggeration in saying that Parāśara's wonderful powers of exposition and interpretation of the lyrical beauty of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār's composition have touched the highest acme in this elaborate and versatile commentary which runs to nearly twenty-two pages in print. Parāśara offers a variety of interpretations for this verse in the general context of the entire section which contains 30 stanzas. The interpretations he offers are from different view-points taking each decade as a unit closely connected with one another. These standpoints are those of the *mūlamantra* (the *aṣṭākṣara*), the *dvayamantra* and the *caramaśloka*,[30] the three components of the sacred syllable, namely the letters *a*, *u* and *ṁ*; and so on. The main point is that the stanza in question reflects the mood and sentiment of the Āḷvār who places himself in the position of a *nāyikā*

and describes to her close confidant, feelings of wonder, suspense, anxiety, love, fear and thrill she experienced when she saw her beloved from close quarters as a sort of agreeable surprise, which confuses her regarding the real identity of the person, making her almost identify that person as the Supreme Lord Himself. The inner idea is that the Supreme Lord (*para*) with whom the *nāyikā* is in love, no longer appears as inaccessible but as *sulabha* (easily accessible). Every line of this commentary is replete with a variety of references and quotations from several sources like the *Upaniṣad*-s, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Gītā* and *Kāvya*-s like those of Kālidāsa[31] and Bhartṛhari,[32] testifying to the wide range of scholarship of our author and his mastery over the *Divya-prabandham.*

In addition to the above works of Parāśara we have quite a few Tamil *nirvāha*-s, which are interpretations of some of the expressions or passages found in the *Divya-prabandham.* These interpretations have come down to us through the references found in the commentaries on the *Tiruvāymoḷi* such as *Ārāyirappaḍi, Onpadināyirappaḍi* and *Muppattārāyirappaḍi.* Parāśara who was an authority on the *Divyaprabandham* used to give regular discourses (*kālakṣepa*-s) on it in the course of which he used to explain in his own inimitable style several important and knotty passages, much to the delight of his fortunate audience. It is these interpretations, elucidations, explanations or justifications of Parāśara that are known in tradition as *Bhaṭṭar-nirvāham*-s.

All the available works of Parāśara including the stray verses will be taken up for a detailed study in the following

CHAPTER III
DETAILED STUDY OF THE WORKS

AṢṬAŚLOKĪ

The opening verse of this octad explains the significance of the three syllables 'a', 'u' and 'ṁ' constituting the *praṇava* with which the *aṣṭākṣarīmantra* (called *mantrabrahman* by the author) begins. The second verse deals with the indeclinable *'namaḥ'* forming the middle part of this sacred *mantra.* The third verse expounds the significance of the word *'nārāyaṇāya'* , used in the dative case. The fourth verse sets forth the difficulties that stand in the way of a devotee and suggests the means of avoiding them. In the fifth stanza the author recommends meditation and the benefits which can be derived from the *dvaya mantra.* The sixth verse speaks of the importance of resorting to Lakṣmī and getting rid of the feelings of 'I' and 'mine' which constitute the *dāsya-* attitude congenial for liberation. In the seventh verse Parāśara paraphrases Lord Kṛṣṇa's assurance found in the *Bhagavadgītā - (xviii, 66) "sarvadharmān parityajya"...*[1]. In the last verse the author appeals to the Lord that in spite of the above assurance, he is still unable to decide on what to do. Even the idea of surrendering to the Lord stems from His grace. As such he has to wait for salvation, firmly believing that the Lord would forgive all his sins.

STANZA 1

The *praṇava* constitutes the three syllables, 'a', 'u' and 'ṁ'. 'A' connotes Viṣṇu as the creator, sustainer and destroyer of the universe as both its instrumental

individual soul who is a mere instrument subserving the Lord, meant for His exclusive use and satisfaction. The syllable 'u' coming in between, indicates the inseparable relationship between these two with a restriction (*niyamayati*). To explain, the sentient and the insentient entities are both subservient to the Lord.

STANZA 2

The indeclinable *'namas'* which is the second unit in the sacred *mantra (praṇava + namo nārāyaṇāya)* explains the essential nature of the individual soul. *Namaḥ* which literally means 'salutations to', can be split again into two syllables and is read along with the syllable 'ṁ' of the *praṇava.* Thus we have the clause 'ṁ', 'na' and 'maḥ', which can be interpreted as *ma,* the *jīva, na*=not, *maḥ*=mine (*maḥ* is genitive singular of 'ṁ'). In other words it means that the *jīva* is not for his own sake. Another interpretation: *namaḥ* as a single unbroken unit means 'salutations' which is the means *(upāya)* of attaining salvation. Another interpretation: if we split this indeclinable as *'na+maḥ'* and then take *namaḥ* together as a single word, we get the expression *namaḥ na maḥ.* This means that the *upāya* mentioned above is not for myself, that is, even that is for the sake of the Lord. Finally by construing the two syllables *na+maḥ* along with the last word of the *mantrabrahman* we arrive at the expression *nārāyaṇāya na maḥ,* which means that even the service which is the very purpose of human existence is for the sake of the Lord and not for anybody else.

In other words the term *namaḥ,* connotes that (1) the individual is the subject of the Lord; (2) the means and the goal of salvation are also dependent on the will of

is, *kaiṅkarya,* called *vṛtti* is meant for the Lord only; and, that (4) even the *upāya* is not for the *jīva.*

STANZA 3

The word *nārāyaṇa* used in the fourth case as *nārāyaṇāya* is explained in this verse. It is composed of two words *nara* and *ayana,* which mean 'the abode of *nara*-s', that is, the individual souls which are eternal (*nitya*). The expression *namo nārāyaṇāya* means that 'I' (*svayam*) exist for the sake of 'a' namely Nārāyaṇa and not for my own sake. The dative termination 'ya' in the expression *nārāyaṇāya* conveys that the service and devotion of the individual soul under all conditions and at all times are meant for the Lord alone.

STANZA 4

For one who has the erroneous attachment towards his body as the self, Parāśara offers the advice that one should constantly contemplate on the third syllable of 'praṇava' which is 'ṁ'. This would help one to get rid of the mistaken identity that the body is the self, by enlightening the real nature of the individual soul. If a man becomes blinded by the feeling that he is an independent agent of actions, ignoring the fact that he is always dependent upon the Lord, Parāśara advises him to meditate upon the first sacred sound of the syllable namely 'a'. This would put him in the right perspective, pointing out the supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu. In the case of those who wrongly believe that they are under the control of some other beings inferior to the Lord, Parāśara advises them to meditate upon the second syllable 'u'. This 'u' would bestow upon them a constant awareness of their relationship with the Lord. Still if an aspirant feels that he can take care of his own self (*ātmatrāṇa*),

independent of the Lord, Parāśara feels that he should concentrate on the expression *namaḥ (na+maḥ),* which quickly removes any feeling of individual self-sufficiency. In the case of those who are carried away by worldly relationships and ties of blood, such persons should constantly remind themselves of the word *nārāyaṇa.* This, as explained earlier, points to the Lord as the ultimate goal of all human endeavour. Lastly, if the aspirant is enslaved by the sensual enjoyments, he should think repeatedly of the connotation of the dative suffix 'ya',[2] which means 'for the sake of'. This, at once, brings him to the senses and reminds him of the fact that he is 'for the sake of Lord Nārāyaṇa', and that sensual enjoyment is not the *summum bonum* of human existence.

Parāśara wants to drive home the point that the *mantrabrahman* offers full protection to the erring individual soul provided he cares to recite it everyday. It never fails him and always shows him the correct path by pointing out the exact relationship in which he stands with the Supreme Being.

STANZA 5

The first four verses thus explain the significance of the *aṣṭākṣarī-mantra* which forms the first of the *Rahasyatraya* of the Śrīvaiṣṇava school. In the fifth stanza, Parāśara explains the significance of the *dvaya-mantra,* that is, *śrīmannārāyaṇacaraṇau śaraṇam prapadye and śrīmate nārāyaṇāya namaḥ.* This *mantra* has two parts in it comprising six words. The first term *Śrī* which is the name of the consort of Lord Nārāyaṇa connotes the sense of guidance or leadership (*netṛtvam*). It is Goddess Śrī who ushers the devotee unto the Lord, pleads on behalf of the devotee and ultimately secures his deliverance.[3] This ...

The termination *matup* in *śrīman* indicates eternal relationship (*nityayoga*) subsisting between the Lord and *Śrī.* The term *nārāyaṇa* which literally means 'the abode of *nara*-s' brings out the benevolent qualities of the Lord (*samucita-guṇa-jāta*) such as compassion and easy accessibility. The word *caraṇau* meaning 'feet' indicates the graceful figure of the Lord (*tanukhyāpanam*). The word *śaraṇam* meaning 'whole-hearted surrender' points to the *upāya* to be employed by the soul for his own salvation. The word *prapadye* ('I resort to') explains the duty to be discharged by the devotee (*kartavyabhāga*). All the words of the first part of the *dvayamantra* are thus explained.

The second part of the *mantra* — *śrīmate nārāyaṇāya namaḥ* suggests four more essentials. The word *śrīmate* stands for the divine couple *Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa* who are the masters of all the *jīva*-s. The stem *nārāyaṇa* actually conveys the lordship and sovereignty of Viṣṇu (*svāmitvam*). The dative case in the word *nārāyaṇāya* lays stress upon eternal service to be done by the *jīva* to his master (*prārthanā*). Finally the word *namaḥ* indicates the desirability of getting rid of egotism which is a very powerful impediment in securing liberation (*virodhiprahāṇa*). Parāśara explains further that this *dvayamantra* protects one who repeats it and is part of the *śruti* itself.

STANZA 6

The sixth verse is specially devoted to a resume of the *dvayamantra* treated earlier, with special reference to the role played by Lakṣmī as a meditator (*puruṣakāra*) between the Lord and the man. Already this concept has been dealt with by the Āḷvār-s, and explained by Ācārya-s like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja in their *Stotraratna*

and *Gadyatraya* respectively. According to this tradition Parāśara resorts to Śrī first (*śrī-prapatti*) and then approaches the Lord through her mediacy. Śrī is called the mistress of all the universe (*Īśānā*), the consort of the Supreme Lord and ever associated with Him. The author also suggests in this context the etymologies of the word *Śrī* as 'one who is resorted to by others' (*Śrīyate*) and as 'one who abides in the highest abode' (*Śrayate*). This incidentally explains the term *Śrīmat* forming part of the *dvayamantra.* Explaining the word *Nārāyaṇa* forming part of the same *mantra* , Parāśara calls him 'one who is the repository of all benevolent qualities' which make Him one who is fit to be resorted to. According to the commentator Nārāyaṇamuni, these qualities which draw a devotee are tweleve in number such as *Sauśīlya* (capacity of uniting easily with the layman), *Vātsalya* (parental affection), *Kāruṇya* (compassion)*Audārya* (generosity), *Kṛtitva* (the capacity to fulfil any undertaking), *Kṛtajñatva* (gratefulness), *Svāmitva* (Lordship), *Sulabhatva* (easy accessibility), *Sarvajñatva* (Omniscience), *Sarvaśaktitva* (Omnipotence), *Paripūrṇatva* (perfect plenitude) and *Paramaudāryatva* (remarkable magnanimity).[4] Parāśara declares that he surrenders at the feet of Hari who is thus known as the supreme benefactor to all humanity. This, in other words, is the path of *Śaraṇāgati* as distinguished from that of *Bhakti.*

Explaining the latter portion of the *dvayamantra,* Parāśara states that he aspires to render *dāsya* (service without any reservation or spatio-temporal condition) to the Lord who is ever associated with Śrī, she being a means towards that end. He has thus brought out the meaning of the word *namaḥ* also, which is the last member of the *dvayamantra.* As in the *mūlamantra,* the word

namaḥ here also expresses the desire to remove all the egotism and selfishness (*nirmama*). The commentator further points out the method of construing the sentences of this verse according to the old tradition, in which the second part (*uttarakhaṇḍa*) is understood first, and then the first part (*pūrvakhaṇḍa*).

STANZA 7

In the subsequent verse Parāśara explains the connotation of the third *rahasya* which in the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition is known as the *Caramaśloka.* The word *Carama* means, literally, the last and final one. The *Caramaśloka* is the verse - *sarvadharmān,* etc., found as the 66th verse of the eighteenth chapter of the *Bhagavad Gītā,* which, strictly speaking, is not the last verse of the chapter. However the word *Caramaśloka* is to be understood as the verse which spels out the final *upāya* of salvation which is *prapatti* or *śaraṇāgati.* Though not a *mantra* in the regular sense of the term, this *śloka* is still considered as a *rahasya* and the *sāttivika*-s impart it as a *rahasya* only to those who have surrendered to them as disciples, points out the commentator.[5]

This *Caramaśloka* consists of twelve words. The first half comprising six words enjoins *śaraṇāgati* on one who stands helpless. The second half brings out the human end (*puruṣārtha*) which follows the implementation of *śaraṇāgati* and this *puruṣārtha* is of the form of removal of the impediments which are undesirable (*aniṣṭa*). Parāśara explains the meaning of this *rahasya* in the words of the Lord himself: "...give up whatever *dharma* has been stated by Me through scriptures as the means of reaching Me, and resort to Me alone as the means of reaching me with full conviction and utter helplessness. Once you are thus determined, I, full of perfections such

as all-round Knowledge, Lordship, Independence and Mercy shall relieve you of all the impediments that stand in attaining Me. Stop grieving."

Explaining the word *pratibandhaka* (impediment) the commentator states that both merit *puṇya* and demerit *pāpa* stand in the way of reaching God and hence both are to be avoided.[6]

STANZA 8

The final verse is in the form of the conviction made by an individual soul before the Lord. This may be explained as follows: "O Lord Hari! I am fully convinced of the fact that I am entirely dependent upon your will, at all times. As such I am unable either to implement or totally give up several disciplines mentioned by you in the *Gītā* such as those of *karma, jñāna* and *bhakti.* Even regarding *prapatti,* I am in the same state of mind and I am helplessly miserable. However, I remember he final means (*carama-upāya*) mentioned by you as he charioteer of Arjuna, and I am fully convinced that ou are going to absolve me of all the sins or impediments hat stand in the way of my reaching your feet."

Parāśara makes it thus clear that a real devotee finds t extremely difficult to implement or give up any of he four means of salvation including *śaraṇāgati.* The eason for such a helpless state of mind is the fact that he individual soul has no independence whatsoever to dopt any means, nor does he have any knowledge egarding the suitability of a particular means to his own eculiar condition in life. As such there is no other way or such an ardent devotee than to recollect the idea onveyed by the Lord through the *Caramaśloka,* and be fully prepared, without any speck of doubt, to

place complete trust in the Lord that He would clear all the impediments that lie in the path of his spiritual progress. This conviction, this trust, relieves him of all undue worries and makes him happy and blissful till he attains his goal.

The commentator Nārāyaṇamuni notes towards the end that the meanings of the *mūlamantra, dvayamantra* and *caramaśloka* are explained through the first, fifth and seventh verses of this hymn respectively.[7] A further point of interest according to some is that Parāśara belongs to that category of *prapanna*-s who adopt the *sadvāraka-prapatti,* that is, *prapatti* which is subsidiary to *bhakti,* and thus differs from those to whom *prapatti* is the principal factor (*aṅgin*), called *advāraka-prapatti.*[8]

BHAGAVADGUṆADARPAṆA

The *Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa* is the name of Parāśara's commentary on the *Viṣṇusahasranāmastotra,* which forms chapter 149 of the *Anuśāsanaparvan* (13th *parvan*) of the *Mahābhārata.* It has to be mentioned that this popular *stotra* has received nearly 40 commentaries of which Śaṅkaras commentary seems to be the earliest. Parāśara's commentary differs from those of others in being Viśiṣṭādvaitic in approach and very elaborate in exposition, quoting profusely not only from the *Upaniṣad*-s and the Epics but also from a number of *Purāṇa*-s. The name of the commentary *Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa* ('a mirror to the qualitites of the Lord') makes it clear that according to Viśiṣṭādvaitins the Supreme Brahman is not *nirguṇa* as held by the Advaitin, but an abode of a number of auspicious qualities. In fact Parāśara discusses the relative importance of the *saguṇa*-texts and explains the *nirguṇa*-texts as speaking of the Lord as bereft of all the undesirable qualities.

The introduction to this commentary is very elaborate and Parāśara discusses several issues which are directly connected with the validity of the great Epic itself. It may be asked as to why Parāśara should devote so much attention and time to prove the validity of the fifth Veda as a text equal in status with the *Rāmāyaṇa.* The answer is twofold: (1) Proving the authenticity of the *Mahābhārata* is fundamental to the establishment of the validity of the *Sahasranāmastotra* which forms part of the Great Epic; and, (2) the validity of certain sections of the *Mahābhārata* is questioned by some critics. For instance, the *Śāntiparvan* is known to be highly interpolated. Parāśara mentions clearly that even as the meaning of the *Veda*-s is to be ascertained with the help of the *Ithihāsa*-s and *Purāṇa*-s, for the superiority of the *Itihāsa*-s over other forms of literature is to be understood with the help of *Purāṇa*-s. Moreover in the verse *itihāsapurāṇābhyāṁ vedaṁ samupabṛṁhayet,* the *Purāṇa*-s are mentioned subsequent to the *Itihāsa*-s and hence the *Itihāsa*-s are more important.

Parāśara then speaks of the importance of the particular chapter giving the thousand names of the Lord, adducing six reasons. They are; (1) this chapter is the essence of the *Mahābhārata* which itself is a great supplement to the *Veda*-s; (2) these names are sung by great sages; (3) they have been arranged by Vyāsa, who is an authority on the *Veda*-s; (4) Bhīṣma considers these names and their chanting as an act of supreme merit; (5) all the great personalities have accepted it to be so; and, (6) it is in conformity with the spirit of the *Gītā* and other such scriptural texts. In the subsequent paragraphs Parāśara, quoting from *Purāṇa*-s such as the *Bhaviṣyat, Matsya, Viṣṇu* and *Mārkaṇḍeya* justifies the

out that this chapter of the thousand names forms part of the *Anuśāsanaparvan* which is the heart of the *Itihāsa.* The context is where Bhīṣma expounds the duty of charity as laid down in the *śāstra*-s.

These thousand names are uttered with devotion by a wide range of scholars for attaining spiritual felicity and material prosperity. Medical authorities such as Caraka and literary luminaries such as Bāṇa acknowledge the efficacy of the *Sahasranāmastotra.*[10] Coming to the subject-matter proper, Parāśara states that Yudhiṣṭhira puts six questions to Bhīṣma which he answers subsequently in a more or less reverse order. The first question concerns the supreme deity. The question here is general in character and does not specify any deity. The second question is as to what constitutes the supreme value for a man to pursue. The next question is about an easy means of reaching the highest goal. The fourth question is regarding a more difficult means towards the same end. The fifth question concerns the highest heaven, the full conception of an ideal endeavour for man to reach the highest goal. The last question is regarding the matter for a proper *japa* (devoted chanting).

In reply, Bhīṣma takes up the last question of *japa* first. According to him, he who praises the Lord with the thousand names is always 'above all others'. The object of worship is Puruṣottama - the Highest Being who can be approached through meditation, praise and adoration. Incidentally Parāśara introduces the concept of loving devotion to God. He defines it thus -*svāmini dāsasya anurāgamayī sthitiḥ.* In other words, this is the condition of a servant or a subordinate with reference to his master or Lord - a condition suffused by *anurāga* or pure love. In such a state the object of love is the highest in esteem and in fact fills the devotee with supreme

love. It is an ecstatic condition of subservience or a mere sense of dependence. It is a spiritually devoted condition wherein both the adored and the adorer share ineffable bliss. The third question is then answered by saying that the Lord alone is to be extolled. The fifth question is taken up next. Bhīṣma replies that in his considered view, the highest virtue is worshipping Lord Viṣṇu, the celebrated deity with the lotus-eyes, by means of hymns of praise and devotion. This includes worship in all aspects such as repeating sacred names (*japa*), singing aloud the names (*stotra*) and carrying out elaborate ritual worship (*arcana*). Elucidating this point Parāśara brings out the whole implication of *Bhaktiyoga* with extensive quotations from the spiritual literature of the past. *Bhakti* is a matter of great happiness and is easy to practise. One can realise the Godhead by this path and every one is entitled for it. In other words the *adhikāra,* the qualification for practising *bhakti,* is universal. Distinctions of birth, knowledge and the like do not stand in the way of practising *bhakti.* It is also worth noticing in this context that Parāśara takes his stand on the word *nara* itself[11] and seems to set aside the restrictions imposed on certain communities in the *apaśūdrādhikaraṇa* of the *Brahmasūtra* itself.[12] Likewise he explains the word *sadā* of the same verse to mean that no restriction of time or place or even sanctity need be observed for practising *bhakti.* Regarding the two other questions it is replied that attaining Lord Viṣṇu who is Brahman of the *Upaniṣad-s* is the highest goal of life. The nature of Viṣṇu is also explained in brief as the supreme, ultimate and auspicious Being who is the sole cause of creation, maintenance and destruction of the universe. Bhīṣma reiterates that the repetition of these thousand names of the deity purifies one from all sins and removes all sorrow.

Parāśara also discusses the point of the Supreme Being becoming the material as well as the efficient cause of the entire universe. All the beings are said to emanate from Brahman, exist in Brahman and merge in Brahman.[13] Parāśara argues that an effect can merge only in its material cause like the web of the spider getting absorbed in the spider's saliva itself.[14] The letter *ca*[15] of the verse further points out that Brahman is also responsible for the maintenance and activity of the universe, thus pointing to His constituting the efficient cause. Scriptural texts such as *yato vā imāni*[16] and *brahma vanam*[17] and the *Brahmasūtras: janmādyasya yataḥ*[18] and *prakṛtiśca*[19] etc., are quoted in support. Parāśara further refutes the view entertained by some Śaiva schools that for the universe, Lord Nārāyana is the material cause and Maheśvara forms the efficient cause.[20] Such a view is clearly non-Vedic, he points out. There cannot be any possibility of Brahman being vitiated by modification in this process because when Brahman evolves as the universe, He does so through a very minute portion of *prakṛti* which consitutes His body. Here again the analogy of the spider and its web is to be pressed into service.

Another point explained by Parāśara in this context is the supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu over other divinities such as Brahmā and Śiva. Several scriptures categorically declare Nārāyaṇa, also known as Viṣṇu, Puruṣottama, etc., as the supreme, referring to Him by name.[21] Viṣṇu's supremacy is also clear from a number of other Vedic and Upaniṣadic passages which are in tune with the above. These are the *Puruṣa-sūkta, the Subālopaniṣad, the Maitrāyaṇīyopaniṣad, the Chāndogya, the Taittirīya* and the *Mahopaniṣad* and also a number of *Sāttvikapurāṇas.* That the *Itihāsas* are emphatic on this issue is quite evident. Sages known for their direct perception and intuitive

knowledge of the highest truth, such as Vālmīki, Parāśara and Vyāsa speak of Viṣṇu as the highest being. In addition, the lordship of Viṣṇu can also be understood by His royal bearing - beatific form, weapons, vehicle and episodes bringing out His remarkable prowess and character. All the ācāryas of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition such as Yāmuna and Kūreśa have clearly expressed this view in their *stotrlas.*[22] The *Dahara* and *Vaiśvānara* sections of the first chapter of the *Brahmasūtra* are clear on this point.[23]

Parāśara then enters into an elaborate discussion of the Advaitic view that the concept of *Saguṇa*-Brahman found here is only meant for people of lesser objectives of life, whereas the theory of *Nirguṇa*-Brahman alone can satisfy those who desire salvation. Parāśara in reply points out that the Advaitin is going directly against what the text itself declares. In other words, the expressions *mucyate jantuḥ janma-saṁsārabandhanāt* and *yāti brahma sanāthanam*[24] clearly point out that repeating the names of the Lord, which is the *saguṇa*-method is the means of salvation. Moreover, if the Advaitin posits two Brahmans, one with attributes and another without attributes, the oneness of Brahman which they proclaim becomes undermined. In fact in the context under discussion, Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhīṣma, "What according to you, is the best *dharma*?" and the reply is "This is the best in my considered opinion." But now the Advaitin interprets repetition of the thousand names as a means lower in importance. "Whose words are we to believe in now? The *Saguṇa* and the *Nirguṇa* theories, being mutually contradictory to each other, one cannot be held as leading to the other," states Parāśara.

Parāśara then raises the question as to how Brahman

The Advaitin would naturally reply that *avidyā* is the cause. If that is so, Parāśara points out, "wonderful is the interpretation of the Vedic truth". For one desirous of *mokṣa,* Brahman is said to be the only goal and panacea for all evils of life. But according to the Advaitins that very Brahman is the repository of *avidyā* and is bereft of any perfection. If the defect in Brahman is unreal, the argument that Brahman is attributeless also becomes unreal. That is to say, Brahman becomes endowed with attributes. If, on the other hand, the state of being devoid of attributes is unreal then, Brahman's possession of attributes becomes real. Thus on any alternative, Brahman can be proved to be free from any error, and as full of attributes.

The Advaitin has to answer another question: "Who can remove this *avidyā* from Brahman?" It is replied thus:- "He who realizes the oneness of Brahman." Is it not ridiculous to say that the defect in Brahman can be set right by an individual soul who is himself caught up in the wordly existence? Moreover why should a *saguṇa* passage be treated as secondary in importance? The Advaitin replies that this is due to its being contradicted by the *nirguṇa* texts. Parāśara asks why it cannot be the other way about? Why should this distinction be drawn when both the *saguṇa* and *nirguṇa* passages are equally valid being the same part of the Upaniṣadic corpus. Again, if, as the Advaitin argues, the attributes of Brahman are to be negated only after positing them, Parāśara asks whether it is a written law that the scriptures should speak of the uncontextual things first and refute them later. "It is better to keep off the mud than to touch it and wash it off later."

At this stage the Advaitin may try to press into service a rule of interpretation from the *Mīmāṁsā-sūtra*

paurvāparye pūrvadaurbalyam prakṛtivat[25] according to which a latter passage becomes more powerful and negates the former ones. Parāśara points out that this rule is not universal in application. In the *Mīmāṁsā,* however, since there was no way of understanding the latter passage without negating the former, such a contingency had to be accepted. But in the present case there is no mutual inconsistency between the *saguṇa* - and the *nirguṇa*-passages. Further, if a mere precedence or succession of the passages be the sole criterion for deciding the invalidity or validity of the concerned passages, then even Brahman should be doubted of its very existence, in the light of the later declaration that *śūnya* (void) is the only Reality. But such a statement may be interpreted as expressing the view of the Nihilists (Buddhists) and hence as non-authoritative. Parāśara rejoinders that even on the Advaitic view the *Veda* is the product of the confusion of Brahman and is thus, unreal. As a matter of fact in the Upaniṣadic text *apahatapāpmā vijaraḥ vimṛtyuḥ*[26] etc., reference is made to Brahman being devoid of qualities. But Parāśara points out that this does not mean that Brahman is "qualitiless". It means that Brahman is devoid of all blemishes or despicable qualities, since the same text later on speaks of positive attributes of Brahman such as *satyakāmatva* and *satyasaṅkalpatva.*

Therefore, scriptural texts speaking of *jñāna, śakti,* etc., of Brahman are to be understood as referring to His auspicious qualities. The *nirguṇa*-texts must be taken as denying bad qualities such as undue love and hatred. Passages speaking of His unfailing will and ever-fulfilled desires are clear instances of His auspicious nature. Therefore, a general negation (*sāmānya-niṣedha*) can be understood as restricting a particular aspect (evil qualities). Therefore, it does not follow that Brahman is without

any auspicious qualities. This can also be understood from maxims such as *pada-āhavanīya* and *brāhmaṇa-parivrājaka.*

Moreover Bādarāyaṇa in the *guṇopasaṁhārapāda* of the *Brahmasūtra*[27] raises the objection that the attributes of Brahman understood in the *Śāṇḍilya, Upakosala, Dahara* and other *vidyā*-s are mere mental exercises with no relevance to reality, and then answers that they are positive and real aspects of the Lord to be meditated upon by an aspirant.

Parāśara quotes from a number of *Upaniṣad-s* to justify the point that the Supreme Being is an abode of innumerable perfections in an unsurpassed measure. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa,* the *Bhāgavata* and the *Mahābhārata* are quoted in support.

An objection raised by certain critics is that the names of the Lord strictly do not point to any qualities as such. They just help one to attain to the *nirguṇa*-Brahman by their mere repetition. But this is unsound, says Parāśara. We cannot ignore the usage of words conveying specific ideas which are different from one another. Further Bhīṣma calls these names *gauṇāni* (derived from the qualities and actions of the Lord). In other words it means that they are etymological. Some names, of course, are *vikhyātāni* (well-known) through convention. The *Viṣṇusūkta* also speaks of those who understand the meaning of the names after analysing them into their components.[28] Therefore, the object of using the names is only to remind us of the qualities of the Lord. It is true that the names act like *mantra-s,* reminding us of the qualities of the Lord understood from scriptural passages. But this does not mean that the qualities themselves are non-existent. That is why in the

introductory portion, as also in the concluding portion of the *Sahasranāmastotra,* Bhīṣma extols the *guṇa-s* of the Lord. The enumeration of the names in the body of the *stotra* helps us to recollect those qualities. The point is that uttering even one of the thousand holy names of the Lord can bring us all benefits. Therefore, each name is a *mantra* in itself. Even when the names are uttered without the knowledge of their meaning, still one can attain the full benefit of knowing their meaning in addition to deriving mental peace and a feeling of sanctity.[29]

PARĀŚARA'S METHOD OF INTERPRETATION

It is interesting to note that in interpreting the thousand names of the Lord, Parāśara adopts a unique method making full use of grammar and etymology. He quotes profusely from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Uṇādi-sūtra-s.* He also quotes extensively from the *Upaniṣad-s,* the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* and *Purāṇa*-s like the *Viṣṇudharma,* the *Bhāgavata,* the *Āditya,* the *Garuḍa,* the *Matsya,* the *Harivaṁśa,* the *Liṅga* and the *Varāha.* In addition he also quotes from several *Pāñcarātra āgama-s* like the *Pauṣkara, Sāttvata, Viṣṇutattva, Sanatkumāra* and *Jayākhyasaṁhitās.* Parāśara, then offers what is called *ārṣanirukta,* that is, utilising the interpretation of these words found in the works of ancient seers. This provides ample scope for him to afford a number of interpretations for the names testifying to his profoundly devout attitude. It is worth mentioning that he does not indulge in giving five or six interpretations for one and the same word as done by the Dvaita commentator, Satyasandha.

For Parāśara, the names not only provide the basis

give room for a definite philosophical interpretation. The philosophy that is developed in the interpretation of the thousand names is called the *Bhāgavata* system which has a hoary past. Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*[30] criticises the *vyūha*-theory found in the *Pāñcarātra* texts. But it is surprising to note that he supports this theory in his commentary on the *Viṣṇu-sahasranāmastotra,* while commenting on the name *Caturvyūhaḥ.*[31] But for Parāśara all the thousand names are significantly connected with one another and they systematically articulate the *Bhāgavata* philosophy. According to the *Bhāgavata* system Lord Nārāyaṇa is the *para*-aspect of the Supreme Being, which may be called the primordial pre-cosmic form. This is fully invested with the six-fold perfection or attributes namely *jñāna, śakti, bala, aiśvarya, vīrya* and *tejas.* He then assumes the four *vyuha*-forms, namely Vāsudeva, Śaṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, to carry on different cosmic functions. The next aspect of the Lord is the *Vibhava* form. This is understood as the different incarnations of the Lord such as Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. This is followed by the iconic *arcā* form of Lord duly sanctified and installed in temples. The last aspect which is no less extolled than others is the *antaryāmin*-form where the Lord is concealed as the indwelling principle of every thing in creation. For Parāśara Bhaṭṭa the entire *Sahasranāmastotra* is so designed as to adore the divine in all these modes. These names therefore also have particular sequence, speaking of the *para, vyūha, vibhava, arcā* and *antaryāmin*-forms in that order. Parāśara concludes his *bhāṣya* by declaring that the names towards the end of the *stotra* suggest the path of *arcirādi* by which the fortunate souls proceed and reach the abode of the Lord, from where there is no return.

In the course of his commentary, Parāśara criticises certain concepts of the Advaita school and given below are a few important instances:

(1) The name *Viśvam* is interpreted by Śaṅkara as "that which is not different from Brahman from the ultimate point of view". In other words, the reality of the universe cannot be accepted with the help of scriptural passages which posit co-ordinate predication. According to this view the world is unreal, being different from Brahman.[32] Parāśara points out that this interpretation is misleading. In the first instance the word *Viśva* does not indicate *abheda* (non-difference). Even the question of co-ordinate predication does not arise here because the word *Viśvam* is one of the names of the Lord and names need not be construed in co-ordinate predication. That is why each word has to be taken in its own right independently. This is also clear from the same verse where the next name of the Lord is *Viṣṇu,* which is in the masculine gender as different from *Viśvam* which is in neuter gender.

(2) Explaining the words *mangalaṁ param* (no. 64) Parāśara finds occasion to criticise the Advaitic view that Brahman is of the nature of mere knowledge (*jñaptimatra*) based on texts like *satyam jñānam anantam brahma.*[33] Parāśara explains that the Lord is full of perfections such as Knowledge, Bliss, Power and Lordship. He is usually described as *jñāna* and *ānanda* because these qualities form His quintessential attributes. This has been explained by the *sūtra—tadguṇasāratvāt,*[34] etc. The Lord perceives directly everything by His attributive knowledge and also shines forth Himself even irrespective of that knowledge; He is also referred to as Knowledge and the Knower. That is how the statement *yah sarvajñaḥ sarvavit*[35] has to be interpreted.

(3) Explaining the word *naikamāyaḥ* (no.303), Parāśara points out that the word *māyā* here does not mean unreality (*mithyā*). It mean "a remarkable phenomenon which is a source of infinite wonder" (*mahāścarya*). Parāśara further states that *māyā* is used in scriptures to convey the meanings of *prakṛti* (primordial matter), *jñāna* (knowledge) and a positive mysterious power which can be countered by weapons but not by the knowledge of truth or reality.[36]

In the course of his commentary, Parāśara briefly alludes to the concept of Īśvara acording to the Sāṅkhya-s. Explaining the name *mahotsāhaḥ* (no.173), he points out that Īśvara accepted by the Sāṅkhya-s is no doubt an embodiment of *jñāna,* but still he is declared as a non-agent (*akartā*), which results in his being accepted as lazy and inactive (*alasa*). As distinguished from such a concept, the Viśiṣṭādvaita school accepts the Lord as an infinite reservoir of wonderful dynamism, a quality which makes Him Īśvara. This quality is found in the name *mahotsāhaḥ* which Parāśara explains as *mahān utsāhaḥ utsahanaṁ kartṛtva-lakṣaṇaṁ aiśvaryam.* It is this quality by which the Lord, though unquestionably powerful in bringing into existence the entire universe of name and form with endless modifications so as to suit the karmic enjoyment of good or bad for all the living beings, still follows the natural order of arrangement as in the previous cycles and thus runs the course of the universe.

We also find here a refutation of the *Bhedābheda* view advocated by Bhāskara and Yādavaprakāśa. The followers of Bhāskara maintain that Brahman and *jīva* are essentially non-different and that the apparent diversity and plurality of souls are caused by limiting adjuncts (*upādhi-s*) namely, the bodies. This delimitation of Brahman by *upādhi* is similar to that of the ether by

a pot. Brahman thus delimited becomes subject to transmigration. The actual release results only when the *upādhi-s* are removed. Thus in the state of *mokṣa,* there is no difference at all between Brahman and the *jīva-s.*

According to the school of Yādavaprakāśa which is also known as *Bhedābheda,* both difference and non-difference characterise the relation between Brahman and the *jīvas.* The advocates of this school say that there is non-difference (*abheda*) between the *jīva*-s and Brahman from the view-point of *vyakti* (individual) whereas, at the same time, there is difference (*bheda*) between them. This is illustrated through the analogy of the universal 'cowness' (*gotva*) found between a cow with broken horns (*khaṇḍa*) and a cow with no horns (*muṇḍa*). From the view-point of *jāti* there is unity between these two cows and from the view-point of the individual cows there is difference. But Parāśara points out that scriptural passages like *brahmaveda brahmaiva bhavati*[37] speak of the oneness of the Brahman and the souls in the state of *mokṣa.* "How can then *bheda* be also real?" asks Parāśara. Likewise the other difficulty in the school of Yādavaprakāśa is that it cannot account for the *abheda* and *sāmya* spoken of in respect of Brahman and souls in the state of *mokṣa.* To explain, if non-difference is already a matter of practical experience why should it be again described in the state of liberation? Moreover, how can the scripture which states *paramam sāmyamupaiti*[38] be justified in as much as *abheda* alone is the ultimate truth? It is thus clear that in both the schools, namely, those of Bhāskara and Yādavaprakāśa scriptures which describe the state of release as having *sāmya* and *abheda* at the same time cannot be properly interpreted. But, according to the Viśiṣṭādvaitins, Parāśara points out that *abeda* in the state of *mokṣa* alluded to

ı the *Upaniṣad-s* is only the *sāmya* between Brahman nd the *jīva-s* but not their essential 'oneness'. The *'iṣṇupurāṇa* makes this quite clear thus: *tadbhāvabhāvam ipannaḥ tadāsau paramātmanā, bhavatyabhedī..*"[39] ıccording to this, one who attains similarity with qualities ke knowledge and strength of the Lord, becomes on-different from Him. The word *bhāva* which is used ɔr a second time in this text would otherwise become edundant. The same *Purāṇa*[40] further explains this ondition thus: "the veil (namely, *karma*) having been ispelled, there will no longer be any difference between ıe forms of God and others".[41]

Explaining the name *Mahābuddhiḥ* (no.175), our uthor contradicts the *Mīmāṁsā* view that omniscience s a quality does not inhere in any being including the upreme Brahman. It may be noted in this context that he earlier Mīmāṁsākas of whom Kumārila Bhaṭṭa is one, lo not believe in the existence of God much less in Iis possessing allround knowledge.[42] Parāśara, on the uthority of several passages from the *Upaniṣad-s* as well s from the *Pāñcarātra* text *Jayākhyasaṁhitā* argues in avour of the existence of such an omniscient Being.[43] 'his omniscience has in its scope, a direct, factual and ternal perception of all object in whatever spatio-temporal elation they may exist. Moreover this knowledge of the ord does not depend upon any sense-organ such as ye, etc. Even if the Lord uses such an organ for any ognition, He does so out of His own free will but not s a matter of necessity as in the case of human beings. The names *Puṇḍarikākṣa* (no.112) and *Suciśravāḥ* no.119) point to this feature. As a matter of fact for ne who is endowed with remarkable powers, the ognitions of colour, taste, etc., need not be confined o particular senses only. The serpent, for example, can

use its eyes not only to see but also to hear. "How can such a power be denied in the Supreme Being?" asks Parāśara. Therefore, it is but reasonable to hold that such an Omniscient Being does exist. The statement of the *Ślokavārtika* refuting the *Sarvajña* theory should therefore be interpreted as rejecting the Buddhist theory because the context strongly supports such a possibility. Otherwise that statement is surely against śāstraic declarations.

The unmistakable conclusion to which one is led after a careful study of Parāśara's *Viṣṇusahasra-nāmabhāṣya* is that the thousand names of the Lord are interpreted from the view-point of an ardent devotee who tries to connect each word with the succeeding one so as to yield the beautiful panorama of the glorious personal deity whose infinite virtues, of which compassion is the most prominent, have been responsible for the different manifestations of the Lord, namely, *Para, Vyūha, Vibhava* and *Arcā.* Parāśara does not forget for a moment that the Lord is deeply committed to retrieve His devotees from the clutches of *saṁsāra.* He therefore weaves into his commentary the beautiful theory of *avatāra-s* of which those of Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Narasiṁha are very significantly dealt with. He also mentions other incarnations like Haṁsa, Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Vāmana, Paraśurāma, Buddha, Kalki, Śaktīśa, Dattātreya, Kapila and even Vyāsa. He also goes into the question whether Brahmā, Rudra and others can also be treated as the *avatāra*-s of Lord Viṣṇu[44] since according to the Upaniṣadic declaration *sarvaṁ khalvidam brahma*[45] everything in the universe starting from Brahmā the creator, down to the blade of grass is Brahman itself. Deriving his authority from the *Pāñcarātra* texts like the *Pauṣkara* and the *Sāttvatasaṁhitā,*

the Lord, that is, the *Vyūha-s* and *Vibhava*-s and no other form of another deity should be treated as Viṣṇu's *avatāra-s.*

ŚRĪGUṆARATNAKOŚA

A detailed study of the hymn *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* reveals several facets of the genius that Parāśara Bhaṭṭa was. As already noted, our author is profoundly influenced by his predecessors like Yāmuna, Rāmānuja and his own revered father, Kūreśa, in portraying the qualities of Śrī. It must be noted at the outset that Parāśara Bhaṭṭa identifies Śrī or Lakṣmī the denizen of *Vaikuṇṭha,* with Sītā of Mithilā and identifies her again with Śrīraṅganāyakī, the presiding deity at Śrīraṅgam. It is also worth noting that Śrī is described here not as an elderly matron, not even as a young maiden who has attained efflorescence, but as an adolescent girl, who is just in the confluence of childhood and youth. In verse 43 Parāśara calls this stage *śaiśava - yauvana - vyatikara.* This, it must be noted, is an original and refreshing concept of our author.

Scriptural Authority for the Concept of Śrī

It is interesting to note that Parāśara Bhaṭṭa combines in himself, the rare qualities of a first-rate poet and a critical scholar. One may ask what proof there is for the very existence of Śrī. To silence such critics Parāśara launches into a crucial discussion into the authenticity of her very concept. In verse 20, Parāśara points out that ancient seers hold that the *Veda-s* are the repositories for the gem-like qualities of Śrī.

devi śrutiṁ bhagavatīṁ prathame pumāṁsahḥ
tvatsadguṇaugha maṇikośa gṛhaṁ gṛṇanti

By this Parāśara means that the *Śrīsūkta* glorifies Śrī eloquently as the treasure-house of several perfections. The *Puruṣasūkta,* which may be called the sequel of *Śrīsūkta* identifies Śrī as the consort of Nārāyaṇa.[46]

The *Itihāsā*-s, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata,* the *Smṛti* texts and the *Purāṇa*-s clarify this point raised by the scriptures, says Parāśara.

But it is a distressing fact that unable to perceive this truth embedded in texts of great authority and obviously having fallen outside the purview of the benevolent grace of Śrī, different people have attained conflicting views regarding this world-manifestation and the status of Lakṣmī. Thus the *Cārvāka-s* and other non-Vedic votaries do not accept the validity of the *Veda*-s. Some the like *Sāṅkhya-s* and the Mīmāṁsāka-s refute the concept of a master for this universe. Still others speak of a master but do not attribute any perfections to Him.[47] Still others call Śiva as the Supreme Being. As opinion is thus divided, it is only the devotees of Lord Viṣṇu and His consort Śrī who can see Śrī as the ultimate truth of all the Vedic texts. She is the treasure which is not seen with the naked eye, but which reveals itself to those who have the mental eye, embellished by the collyrium of devotion.[48] The expression *asyeśānā jagato viṣṇupatnī*[49] already has set the tone for the prosperity of Lakṣmī. The *Śrīsūkta* in 15 verses expatiates on this glory of Hers. The *Puruṣasūkta* (*khila* added to the tenth maṇḍala of the *Ṛg-Veda*) speaks of Her consort. All these texts read together thus present a picture of Lakṣmī who is the prosperous, benevolent and unique consort of the Lord of the universe.

In fact, the *Rāmāyaṇa* breathes the life and activities of Lakṣmī in her incarnation as Sītā. In the light of this

it is but reasonable to hold that even the *Smṛti*-s and *Purāṇa*-s (the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* in particular) deal with her glory in great detail.

An interesting question is raised by Parāśara in this context. Why is Śrī not separately eulogised in the *Veda-s* proper? Parāśara himself answers thus: when the supremacy, independence and such other aspects of the Lord are to be ascertained, the glory of Lakṣmī's association with Him forms the corroborative proof. Since Śrī thus forms an integral part of the Lord as the determinant quality, She is not separately mentioned by the *Veda-s.* [50] This cannot therefore be taken as a proof of her non-existence, at least scripturally.

Śrī as the Source of Poetry

A significant point mentioned by Parāśara in the introductory portion of the present hymn is that Lakṣmī is in fact the deity who can bless her devotees with remarkable powers of speech, the art of poesy in particular, should those devotees so desire. Though in fact she is beyond the ken of the poet's fancy or power of poetry, she can still instil in them the sense of confidence to carry on their efforts. Parāśara in all humility states that the qualities of the Goddess such as *kṣānti* (forbearance), *audārya* (magnanimity) and *dayā* (compassion) will become significant when she has accepted even his "unworthy" composition.[51]

Elaborating this idea the poet states that Lakṣmī herself (*svayameva*) perfected the speech of the poet by Her sweet glances. Once her favour is assured, the literary compositions become charming with choice expressions abounding in aptness and elegance.[52] In verse eight Parāśara prays to Śrī to be blessed by Her with

expressions (sound and sense) untouched even by a speck of blemish. Such a composition should exude all good qualities like perspicacity and melody, and please the mind of the reader or listner instantaneously. There should be then a happy blend of words (*saubhrātra*). In fact all the gracious movements of *Vāṇī* - speech as well as the Goddess of speech will be present in one's words when the benevolent glances of Lakṣmī fall upon him.[53] By this statement Parāśara suggests that Śrī is at the very root of the glories of other goddesses like Sarasvatī.

Description of Lakṣmī

As already noted at the beginning, Parāśara pays obeisance to Lakṣmī as She appears in the temple of Śrīraṅgam. She is called here Raṅganāyikā, consort of the Lord Raṅganātha. In what may be called an iconographic description of the Goddess, he presents Her as seated on a lotus with the right leg stretched down to touch the foot-stool, She keeps the left leg folded, so that it may rest on the throne. This may be called the *ardhaparyaṅkāsana* in terms of iconography. Her hand displays the *abhaya-mudrā* indicating that She ever grants asylum. Her face is sweet and innocent.[54] The poet then describes Her lotus-feet which have rendered the *upaniṣad-s* fragrant. They are tender like the petals of a lotus. (*kamalapalāśa*) and when they touch the garland *Vaijayantī* on Her Lord's chest, the garland becomes fresh as it were by a shower of dew.[55]

Her eyes and glances receive special attention of our poet. They have a remarkable effect on whom they fall. Thus kings who are blessed by a particle of Lakṣmī's grace expressed through Her eyes become puffed up with pride. Poets cannot describe them aptly. The power of Her glances is all the more evident when Her own

Lord, who has become the target of Her full length glances becomes *puṇḍarikākṣa* (the eyes large as the lotuses) and is acknowledged by the *Upaniṣad-s* as the Highest Being.[56] By this Parāśara means that the *Chān dogyopaniṣad* describes Viṣṇu as the Supreme Being, only by virtue of his being *puṇḍarīkākṣa* which, in turn, is due to the grace of Lakṣmī. The *Chāndogya* text under reference is *tasya yathā kapyāsam puṇḍarīkam evam akṣiṇī.*[57]

The tenderness of Lakṣmī's physical frame, points our poet, is beyond one's comprehension. Even the pollen of the lotus injures Her feet. Even the looks of the young maids around Her are enough to wither Her limbs. The lotus in the hand is in fact a burden. [58] In verse 46, Parāśara describes the Goddess as bedecked in a variety of beautiful ornaments, which add charm to Her already handsome body. This is like the addition of sugar to milk and the advent of flowers on the beautiful *kalpaka* creeper. In other words, the ornaments form a spontaneously natural feature whose charm merges in the original charm of Her body, discernible only to the prudent eye of a devotee. These are innumerable but a few can be mentioned: *kanaka raśanā* (golden girdle), *muktāhāra* (pearl necklace) *tāṭaṅka* (ear ornaments), *lalāṭikā* (ornament on the forehead), *maṇisara* (gem necklace) and *tulākoṭi* (anklets).[59] Alluding to Her appearance from the milky ocean Parāśara observes that Śrī came out at a time when Her husband was tired in the process of its churning, with His back supporting the *mandara*-mountain. She appeared like the delightful moonlight, sending down showers of nectar on Her Lord through Her smiles and glances.[60]. Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is not happy with those poets who try to compare Her celestial body with things that are artificial and temporary

in nature. For him, though it is beyond the scope of his words, the description should be somewhat as follows: With Her head slightly bent due to the desire within to grant all that the devotees seek from Her, and with the slight inclination towards the other side to shower a glance at Her Lord; She shines like a streak of gold and waves like a garland of *campaka*-flowers.[63]

The Qualities of Lakṣmī

Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is eloquent when he describes vividly the qualities of Śrī which, it can be said are in conformity with the title of this hymn *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* (the treasure house of gem-like qualities of Śrī). These gems are different from one another with their own stamp of individuality. Though these are distinct mutually, they all subscribe in general to the charm of the lady that wears them.

The poet at the outset mentions the qualities that are common between Her and Her Lord. Thus power and strength, might and knowledge, sovereignty and victory, attractiveness and concern to the devotees, fulfilling the desires of the supplicants, fragrance, beauty, charm and brilliance - these are just a few qualities that are common to Her and Her Lord.[61] In fact there are some more qualities which the divine couple possess in a mutually reflective manner as it were. They are: youth, geniality of the heart, a sense of commitment, etc., to each other.[62] The Lord, has some qualities which are peculiar to Himself like *sthiratva* (steadfastness) and *śatruśamanatva* (the power to quell down enemies). The Goddess, has some qualities which are peculiar to Her alone, like *mṛadima* (softness of heart), *pārārthya* (subordination to her Lord),

karuṇā (compassion) and *kṣamā* (forbearance). Again certain qualities and features stand in a striking contrast between the two: the Lord is dark in colour like a rainy cloud (*ghanadyuti*); Śrī, on the other hand, is of golden hue (*kanaka-dyuti*). He is young (*yuvā*); She is adolescent (*mugdhā*). All such qualities stand on one level as contradistinguished from certain special qualities of Hers like forebearance (*kṣānti*), Her tender affection for devotees (*prīti*) and perhaps most important of all, mercy (*dayā*) and magnanimity (*audārya*). As instances for Her quality of *kṣānti,* Parāśara cites the episodes of the *Rāmāyaṇa.* At Laṅkā, Sītā (none other than Śrī) saved the demonesses from the fury of Hanumān. These demonesses were the worst sinners against Her. Rāma saved Kākāsura and Vibhīṣaṇa only when they sought His refuge. Sītā's forgiveness was spontaneous. Thus She excelled even Her Lord in this particular quality.[64] Making a special reference to Śrīraṅgam where the Goddess has manifested Herself as the consort of Lord Raṅganātha, our author notes that all the qualities like *audārya, karuṇā* and *vātsalya* (motherly affection) have been at their highest point of culmination. Her other incarnations like Sītā are all thrown into oblivion in comparison to Her present form as the *arcā* image at Śrīraṅgam. The previous incarnations were only the training ground as it were for this *avatāra.* The quality of *audārya* (magnanimity) can be illustrated by a solitary example. She showers wealth, *kaivalya* (exclusive enjoyment of the soul) and even the highest salvation (*paramapada*) on any one who simply folds his hand in salutation. Even after granting all this She feels ashamed that She could not grant him more.[65] The affection She has for devotees is manifest in Her very act of coming down to this world of mortals. In contrast She does not even care for the milky ocean, though it be Her own father's place; she does not even

think of the Highest abode (*vaikuṇṭha*) though it is Her husband's home. Śrīraṅgam has become Her cherished home because She loves to be there for the sake of Her children.[66]

Śrī as the Source of All Prosperity

Parāśara points out Śrī throughout this hymn, as responsible for all-round prosperity in creation. Beginning from the head of a tiny village up to the omnipotent Lord (Viṣṇu), all owe their power to this Goddess of the universe. A slight degree of difference in Her glances makes all the difference between the high and the low in creation. Thus whatever is best in creation in terms of loftiness (as in mount *Meru*), auspiciousness (as in flower), heaviness (as in the case of *Mandara* mountain), etc., is but a manifestation of an infinitesimal part of Her unbounded splendour.

To explain: if one is at the top of one's glory it is due to the glances of Śrī being directed towards that one. If one, however, is a beggar in the street, it means that the glances of Śrī are turned away from that person.[67] In whatever direction Her glances move, in that direction will rush benefits such as bliss, wisdom, eloquence, courage, prosperity and success.[68] The inequality in creation as between the animate and inanimate, the rich and the poor, the dumb tree and the eloquent Bṛhaspati, the strong and the weak, the good and bad etc., is to be traced to the favour of Śrī[69] or its absence. In a later verse Parāśara emphasises the same point thus: that person on whom the glances of Lakṣmī fall profusely, is designated the Highest Brahman (*Para Brahman*). Those on whom only two or three glances fall are known as Indra and other minor gods. Therefore, if in the Vedic texts one reads about the glory of other gods, it is to

be understood as an indirect assertion of the overall glory of Śrī.[70]

The Role of Lakṣmī in the Cosmic Activities

Parāśara, an ardent devotee of Goddess Raṅganāyaki observes that the cosmic functions of Viṣṇu - Her Lord, namely, creation, sustenance and dissolution of this universe of name and form are meant for the joy of Lakṣmī. Already the picture of Lakṣmī as an adolescent has been presented by our author. It is but natural then to expect the youthful and resourceful Lord to keep His consort amused through such activities. The *Chāndogya* states that the Lord carries on creation, sustenance and dissolution by His mere will (*saṁkalpa*).[71] This very *saṁkalpa* of the Lord to give the sentient and insentient their due status, with all the evolutes like the seven sheaths (*āvaraṇa*), *buddhi* (intellect), *ahaṁkāra* (ego), mind, the ten organs, the elements and the three worlds is only to please His beloved.[72] Even when the Lord makes the *jīva-s* forget their original nature through his *māyā* comprising three qualities, it is but an act calculated to elicit joyous admiration from His consort.

Even in an earlier verse our author points out the decisive role Lakṣmī plays in the creation of the universe. No doubt the *Upaniṣad-s* do speak of the Supreme Brahman, Her consort, as the creator. But who is it that is behind this whole drama? It is Lakṣmī. The Lord creates or keeps quiet only by looking at the knitting of Her eyebrows. That Nārāyaṇa is the Supreme, is a gist of the truth arrived at by the *Upaniṣad-s*, only with the help of the imprints of Her feet on His chest. The infinite greatness of Lakṣmī is too great to be compared to that of the Lord.

The Affinity between Śrī and Her Lord

The mutual love and affection that this divine couple shares is something proverbial and unique. In fact it is only because of Her contact that the Lord is called auspicious - *maṅgaḷam.*[73] When the Lord is said to be glorious and not dependent on another, it is because Lakṣmī is ever associated with Him. When we say that a gem is highly valuable it is because of its lustre which is an integral part of it. By this statement Parāśara seems to suggest that the relationship between the Lord and His consort is one of *samyuktāśrayaṇa.*[74] The love that Lord Viṣṇu has for Śrī is evident from the fact that although all the five weapons (the discus, the conch, the bow, the mace and the sword) are objects of common enjoyment (possession) between both of them, the Lord alone carries them, lest they be a burden to Her.[75] In the same way the love that Śrī has for Him is reflected in Her accompanying the Lord in all His manifestations on earth - as man or as an animal. But for this the Lord's sportive activities would have been dull and insipid. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* are full of incidents which bring out in a full measure the infinite love and affection that the Lord entertains for Her. Thus the Lord churned the milky ocean for Her sake; He built a bridge across the ocean for Her sake alone; earlier He bent and broke the bow of Śiva to win Her hand; His killing the demon Rāvaṇa and his mighty army was to claim Her back. In fact is there anything that the Lord did not do for Her sake?[76] Likewise the love that Śri has for Her Lord is indescribable and incomprehensible. Even if the Lord assumes thousands of hands, feet, faces, eyes etc., He cannot enjoy the grandeur of Her infinite affection. He sinks somewhere in the depth of Her unfathomable love like a mere drop.

?he Relation of Man with the Divine Couple

Although a poem of lyrical beauty, the present work .bounds in philosophical statements which are peculiar ɔ the Viśiṣṭādvaita system. In this one can see that the levotee stands as a son of the divine couple. In fact ıe relation of a *jīva* with Śrī can be explained in the ame language as relation to the Lord also. In verse '2 Parāśara articulates the parental relation, the divine ouple has with the world of creation. As will be explained ıter, Śrī acts as the *puruṣakāra*(mediator) between God nd man. But Parāśara goes a step forward and says ıat even the Lord stands as adorable only because He appens to be Her beloved. Otherwise there is no speciality ıat could be ascribed to Him. Parāśara places himself ı the position of a native of the town of Mithilā. For im the Lord is only of secondary importance; He is ıe son-in-law (*jāmātā*), the beloved of *"our"* Sītā. Of ourse he accords Him all services; he goes to Him, ⁄orships Him and seeks refuge in Him. All this is only n the ground that He is the beloved of Śrī.[77] In the ıst verse also Parāśara consistantly mentions the upremacy and overall importance of Śrī. She is the ıother, father and all that one cherishes as near and ear. If Her grace is assured, there is no room for any omplaint.[78]

RĪRAṄGANĀTHASTOTRA

This *stotra* is again marked by Parāśara's poetic randeur, devotional fervour and loving attachment to rīraṅgam and its presiding deity - Lord Śrīraṅganātha. 'he first of the six verses, composed in the *Sragdharā* ıetre, highlights the majestic picture of Lord Raṅganātha eclining on His serpent-bed in the temple at Śrīraṅgam. 'he main icon (*mūlabera*) in the *sanctum sanctorum*

as can be seen even today, is vividly portrayed here reclining on Ādiśeṣa, closing the eyes in *yoganidrā,* keeping the right hand under His head, and the other near the hip, His feet being gently pressed by Lakṣmī and Bhūmi. In fact this verse describes this picture on the *Vimāna* of the Śrīraṅgam temple, a temple encircled by seven courtyards. This temple is in the central region of the *Kāverī* delta. The poet expresses his prayerful attitude to such a deity in this verse. As is the practice, Parāśara starts the description of the deity from the feet to the crown.

The next *śloka* expresses his ardent desire tinged with remorse as to when he would be able to see the beautiful Face of the Lord once again. As already pointed out Parāśara composed this *stotra* when he was in exile from Śrīraṅgam, residing at Tirukkoṭṭiyūr consequent on some confrontation he had with the then ruler Vīrasundara. Couched in the *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre this verse goes into an enlightening and moving description of the Lord's face which like a lotus, steals the hearts of those who behold it. It has a brilliant pearl crown atop adorning the head. The beautiful lower lip is bedecked by a sweet smile and the eyes are beatific, extending as far as the ears. In fact the first thing that attracts the attention of the onlookers is the *ūrdhva-puṇḍra-tilaka* mark on the Lord's forehead drawn with *kastūrī* (musk).

The succeeding verse in the *Śikhariṇī* - metre brings out the poet's agony in a spirited expression of ardent devotion.

> "When am I going to attend upon the Lord seated in the presence of the Lord chanting His holy names in sheer ecstasy thus: "O Madhumathana! Mādhava! Murāra! Hari! Nārāyaṇa! and Govinda!"

Whatever aspect of the Lord the poet describes, the beautiful surroundings of Śrīraṅgam situated on the banks of the river Kāverī and the serpent-bed of the Lord never escape his notice. He repeats the words Kāverī, Śrīraṅgam and *Bhogīndra* (*phaṇirāṭ*) often times in this hymn.

In the subsequent verse which is again composed in the *Śikhariṇī*-metre, Parāśara wonders as to when he is going to absolve himself of his sins, by plunging into the holy waters of the Kāverī and stay on its banks covered by dense gardens capable of removing all fatigue physical and mental.

> "When am I going to worship the Lord of Śrīraṅgam reclining on Ādiśeṣa possessed of lotus eyes, a repository of auspicious qualities who is adorning the holy bank of the river?"

Again here the poet grieves that he is away from his beloved Kāverī, its sand-banks, its beautiful and cool gardens and above all the Lord presiding over the whole area.

The fifth *śloka* which is set in the *Mandākrāntā*-metre exclusively describes the glory of the town of Śrīraṅgam which is the abode of the Lord. It is surrounded by the Kāverī which always flows full to the brim, inundating the *areca* trees neck-deep, the water itself being tasty and oily. The birds of the town repeat out of joy the Vedic texts being chanted by the devotees. Another important feature is that those who walk in the streets of Śrīraṅgam pluck *as it were mokṣa* with their hands as they pass along. The poet draws one here to the traditional belief that those who stay at Śrīraṅgam or at least sleep one night there attain liberation.

The sixth verse composed in the *Indravajrā*-metre expresses the extremely considered opinion of the poet that birth in the Śrīraṅgam town even as a dog is more covetable than reaching heaven, drinking nectar to one's heart's content and fainting as a result in the Nandana garden of the celestials.

> "I do not want any such heavenly experience. O Lord! let me be born as one among the stray dogs roaming about the streets of Śrīraṅgam."

Śloka-s seven and eight are traditionally treated as *muktaka-s*, not forming part of the original *stotra*, although they are usually chanted along with the preceding verses. The seventh verse is in the form of a poser to the Lord:

> "Even for a wretched creature staying far away from you, O Lord, you show compassion and pacify (*śānti*) the creature, under some pretext. That being the case, I do not know how you are going to grace this wretched creature (referring to his own self) who is standing in your immediate presence."

It may be pointed out in this context that traditional scholars explain this verse as referring to a particular incident that took place in the Śrīraṅgam temple during the lifetime of Parāśara. It seems that a procession of the deity in the Śrīraṅgam Temple was delayed one day and on enquiry Parāśara came to know that a dog strayed into the temple and that the priests were busy consecrating the temple for that reason. Parāśara remarked that the dog did not actually enter the *sanctum sanctorum* and as such there was no need for an elaborate ritual of purification. Therefore, the expression "wretched creature" means the dog in question and the word *śānti* refers to the elaborate ritual of purification undertaken by the temple priests. The word *mithyāpavādena* means

"under false pretext", pointing out that the whole incident was cooked up and that no *śānti* was really needed. Some scholars further see an undertone of sarcasm in the word *mithyāpavādena.* According to them the poet is referring to the practice of some greedy priests who, with a view to earn some money by suggesting such ceremonies, in fact bluff that a dog had entered the temple or sometimes they would themselves deliberately bring a dog into the temple.[79] However, it is not known whether this episode is true or not. If it were true it would only form a sad commentary on the priesthood of the land, as caring more for petty monetary gains by throwing to the winds all decency and decorum in the abode of God.

The last verse found in this stotra - another *muktaka,* speaks of the glory of Śrī Rāmānuja as touring several *divya-deśa-s*. In the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition, a *divya-deśa* is a sanctified place where regular worship had been instituted and sanctified according to the rules laid down in the *Pāñcarātra* - or *Vaikhānasa-Āgama*-s and which have figured in the Tamil songs of the Āḷvārs. Tradition recognises 108 holy places.[80] The places cited here are: Śrīraṅgam and Kariśaila (Kāñcīpuram) (both in Tamilnadu), Añjanagiri (Tirumalai or Tirupati), Tārkṣyādri (Ahobilam), Siṁhācala and Śrīkūrma (all in Andhra Pradesh), Pūrī (Lord Jagannātha as the presiding deity in Orissa), Badarī (the Himalayan shrine) and Naimiśāraṇya (both in Uttar Pradesh), Dvārakā in (Gujarat), Prayāg (Allahabad) Mathurā, Ayodhyā, Gayā (all in U.P.) Puṣkara (in Rajasthan) and Śālagrāma (in Nepal). A devout Śrīvaiṣṇava tries to make a pilgrimage to as many of these holy places as possible in his life-time.

It may not be out of place to add in this context that worshipping the iconic form of the Lord installed

in the shrines and temples is of immense significance in the Śrīvaiṣṇava religious history. Traces of image worship can be found in the post-Vedic literature. The *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* are replete with references to places of worship such as temples and *tīrtha*-s. The worship of sandals of saints and great men which can be traced to the *Rāmāyaṇa,* found its way into the Buddhist religion too. Thus even in religions like Buddhism which is against adoration to any being as a God, we find even among the immediate disciples of Buddha, a tendency to conceive supernatural persons to whom worship may be offered and from whom assistance may be sought. "Though the earliest Buddhist sculptures dared not depict the Buddha as a man, by hinting his presence by such symbols as the sacred wheel and the foot-print, fullfledged images of his were gradually but freely introduced as objects of worship."[81]

Every religious school of Hinduism developed its own *Āgama* tradition and literature. The *Śaiva,* the *Vaiṣṇava-,* and the *Śakta-āgama*-s, regardless of their sectarian leanings, laid down similar or identical canons of art. All these *āgama*-s comprise four sections or topics in general: *jñāna* (knowledge), *kriyā* (service - construction of temples, consecration of the idols etc.), *caryā* (conduct of daily rites, bestivals etc.), and *yoga* (devotion or concentration). Of these, the worship of idols which forms part of the *kriyāpāda* is based upon the conviction that the supreme Being, out of compassion for the suffering humanity condescends and 'enters' the idols made and installed in the prescribed way by competent persons.

According to the *Bhāgavata* tradition (another name for *Pāñcarātra* tradition) there are five aspects of the Supreme Being. They are: *para,* (the Highest called vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa and so on), *vyūha* (fourfold

emanation as Vāsudeva, Saṁkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha), vibhava (several incarnations such as Rāma and Kṛṣṇa), *antaryāmin* (as the inner controller of all beings) and *arcā* (as an icon). Of these the *para* aspect is in the Highest abode of the Lord and the next, namely the *vyūha*-s are also beyond the conception of ordinary men. The *vibhava*-s are the incarnations of the Lord which have already come and gone. The *antaryāmin* aspect is too subtle to contemplate. As such the *arcā* form alone is quite accessible and suitable to all who are interested in the spiritual *sādhanā.* Piḷḷai Lokācārya beautifully explains the nature of these aspects of the Lord in his *Śrīvacana-bhūṣaṇa.*[82] According to him the *antaryāmin* form is like the subterranian water which can be obtained only after great efforts. The *para*-aspect is like the waters which are supposed to surround the cosmic egg. The *vyūha*-s are like the milky ocean. The *vibhava*-s are like the flood waters which have already disappeared in the sands of time. The iconic form (*arcā*) is like the pools of water left behind by those floods.

It is in the light of this interpretation of the significance of *arcā* that we have to understand the descriptions of the Lord's idols found in hymns like the *Śrīraṅganāthastotra* and *Śrīraṅgarājastava.* In fact this idea is expressed by Parāśara himself in the following verse:

śrīmadvyoma na sīma vāṅgmanasayossarve'vatārāḥ kvacit
kāle viśvajanīnametaditi dhīḥ śrīraṅgadhāmanyatha
ārtasvāgatikaiḥ kṛpākaluṣitairālokitairārdrayan
viśvatrāṇavimarśanaskhalitayā nidrāsi jāgaryayā
Śrīraṅgarājastava (II.75)

ŚRĪRAṄGARĀJASTAVA

This work is in two centuries of verses called the *Pūrvaśataka* and *Uttaraśataka* with 127 and 105 *śloka*-s respectively. Traditional accounts record that this magnificent poetic piece came from the pen of Parāśara when he returned to Śrīraṅgam from the exile in Tirukkoṭṭiyūr, after the demise of the ruler Vīrasundara with whom he fell out earlier.

The first sixty-two verses of the first century describe the preliminaries of the main act namely, approaching the Lord in the *sanctum sanctorum* and the remaining text gives a detailed description of the *arcā* aspect of the Lord from top to toe. According to traditional scholars the first *śataka* expounds the meaning of the first part of the *dvaya-mantra* and the *Uttaraśataka* deals with the meaning of the second part of the *dvaya-mantra.*

In the opening verse, Parāśara pays obeisance to his revered father Śrīvatsacinha (alias Kūreśa) whose compositions form the *maṅgalasūtra* on the neck of *trayī* (the three *Veda-s*), personified as a woman. The expression on the 'neck' (*kaṇṭhe*) of this verse suggests the great contribution of Kūreśa to the vedāntic literature. The five *stotra*-s of Kūreśa which teem with philosophical ideas may be taken as being referred to here. In the second verse he refers to his own preceptor known as Govinda Bhaṭṭa (*Embār*) who, by his close attachment to the feet of Śrī Rāmānuja, is also known as *rāmānujapadacchāyā* ('the shade of Śrī Rāmānuja's feet'). The three following verses refer to Śrī Rāmānuja, Yāmuna and Nāthamuni, the three great *ācārya*-s who were responsible for spreading the message of devotion and detachment in the world. Verse six pays homage to Saint

hymns (in other words, who composed in Tamil the *Tiruvāymoḷi* which is the quintessence of the *Sāmaveda* which is supposed to have had thousand branches). Parāśara also describes Nammāḷvār as an embodiment of the 'ardent longing' (*tṛṣṇā*) for Lord Kṛṣṇa. *Śloka*-s in praise of Goddess Śrī or Raṅganāyakī the consort of Lord Raṅganātha are also found. In what may be called a doctrinal statement the poet mentions that the universe containing the distinction in terms of the ruler and the ruled is so formed because of the knitting or otherwise of the eyebrows of this Goddess. Verses 8 to 12 describe Lord Raṅganātha reclining on the serpent-bed, as the beloved consort of Lakṣmī and as the wielder of five weapons. In a beautiful simile Parāśara compares the God reclining on Ananta to the Cintāmaṇi-gem which also adorns the chest of Goddess Lakṣmī. His supremacy can be ascertained only by the foot-prints of Lakṣmī marked on His chest (in red lac). But for this, this particular entity (*vastu*) can never be described adequately by any term (śl. 9). Śrī Raṅgarāja is also identified with a black bee (*bhṛṅga*) which is always attracted to the breasts of Lakṣmī, again identified with two bunches of flowers of a *kalpa*-creeper. 'May such Lord bless us with all welfare for a hundred years', says Parāśara. The Lord is wielding five weapons always, being unable to delay any further the protection of those who surrender to Him, fancies our poet. From *śloka*-s 13 to 19, Parāśara in all humility justifies his undertaking to compose the present *stotra* on the Lord whose glory even the *Veda* fails to describe in definite terms, doubting its own capacity to comprehend His nature. It is, as a matter of fact, unfair to attempt to describe Him who shines in all glory through the Sanskrit and Tamil Vedic literature. But the poet wonders as to who can prevent a young elephant (namely Raṅganātha) if he, even after

a ceremonial bath, chooses to spray himself with dust[83] that is, to accept the composition of Parāśara? The two main reasons which have prompted Parāśara to compose this *stotra* are: (1) hailing from a family of devotees of the Lord who have overcome the influence of *māyā* by whole-hearted surrender, and (2) the confidence aroused in him by being adopted by the Lord and His consort as their son. Further, even as the *Veda-s* though incompetent to do full justice to the glory of the Lord still undertake such an effort, our poet also would like to praise Him in his own way.

In the succeeding five verses (20 to 24) our poet enters into the graphic description of the river Kāverī who by her holy waters offers solace and delight to all that enter into them and who embraces the Lord by her wavy hands. The poet also gives the other names of the river like Hemāpagā or Kanakā (Ponni in Tamil) Marudvṛthā and Sahyakanyā ('born from the Sahya mountain'). The sandbank forming the islet where the Śrīraṅgam town is situated receives the poet's attention next. The river Kāverī surrounding the island flows in such a manner that plantain, areca, rose-apple and other trees are immersed neck-deep in its waters. These trees create the delusion that a chain of clouds is hanging down to drink water from the river. The poet identifies the present island of Śrīraṅgam with the highest abode of the Lord, namely, Śrīvaikuṇṭha where live the liberated souls. The Virajā river of the highest heavens is identified with Kāverī. The poet aspires to move about freely in the beautiful and holy gardens around the temple which are gently waited upon by Kāverī and which remove the fatigue of worldly existence for *Vaiṣṇava-s* These gardens also reverberate with vedic chants. In a fit of poetic fancy, Parāśara states that the trees and plants

on this island such as the areca, jack and plaintain are irrigated by the sweet and nectarine channels of water issuing from coconuts which are split by the fish that toss up in a sportive mood (śl. 25 to 27).

The holy town Śrīraṅgam, Parāśara repeats, is the same as the celestical abode of Viṣṇu known as Ayodhyā and Aparājitā[85] glorified in the *Veda*-s. The chain of high mansions of this town seems to connect heaven and earth in a bid to render even the worldly life divine. Next Parāśara also pays homage to the guardian deities of the town such as Kumuda, Kumudākṣa and Puṇḍarīka who, mounted on their vehicles and wielding their characteristic weapons, always protect the people.

The sanctity of the town is further glorified by Parāśara when he says that even the eternally liberated souls (*nitya*-s), the liberated ones (*mukta*-s) and those bound souls (*baddha*-s) who consider this particular birth as the very last one, all resort to this town by taking up the configurations as men, animals and plants respectively (śl. 28 to 33).

The number of *gopura*-s and the *prākāra*-s (outer walls) of the temple appear to a devout person as Garuḍa himself protecting the Lord with his magnificent wings. Parāśara also records a traditional view that Parakālakavi (Tirumaṅgai Āḷvār) constructed the *maṇimaṇḍapa*-hall by using the golden images of Buddha who were defeated by him earlier in a verbal duel (śl. 36).

What follows then is the description of the sentinels, namely, Caṇḍa and Pracaṇḍa, and the thousand-pillared hall which reminds the poet again of Śri Vaikuṇṭha, described in the *Veda*-s as having such a thousand pillared hall. In the following two verses, the tank called *Candrapuṣkariṇī* is described as the place in whose waters

the Lord and His consort sport and which provides them various kinds of flowers serving as umbrellas, ornaments, etc. One who dips himself in its water is sure to get rid of his *tāpatraya* (śl. 39-40).

The next important description is that of the *Śrīraṅga-Vimāna* which is a replica of the highest abode of the Lord, namely, Śri Vaikuṇṭha, known as "Aparājitā."

The image of Lord Narasiṁha on the Gopura, the images of ācārya-s and the Punnāga-tree[86] in the precincts receive appropriate attention from our poet (śls. 46 to 49). Mention may be made here of the traditional practice of Nammāḷvār's *Tiruvāymoḷi* being constantly recited and expounded under the shade of this Punnāga-tree. The poet points out that the divine fragrance of the Punnāga-blossoms owes its origin to the constant "waterings" of its roots through these *Sahasra-gītī (Tiruvāymoḷi)* chantings.

Viṣvaksena, his consort Sūtravatī, and his four chief attendants, namely, Gajānana, Jayatsena, Harivaktra and Kālaprakṛti are glorified then (śl. 50-52). The next description is of Garuḍa who is facing the Lord as His gem-studded mirror and his two consorts Rudrā and Sukīrti are followed up next (śl. 53-54).

The Lord's five weapons, the Sudarśana in particular, Hanumān and Vibhīṣaṇa and the two pillars adjacent to the *sanctum sanctorum* which are called Tirumaṇattūṇ in Tamil and Āmodastambha in Sanskrit are then described (śl. 55-59). The actual description of the Lord, His consorts, His serpent-couch and His paraphernalia come in for more elaborate eulogy (śl. 60-63).

Then follows a series of metaphors where Lord Raṅganātha is identified with a pond having many lotuses

Goddess Earth is the reflection of that swan. This lotus-pond known as Śrīraṅgarāja is not artificial. It is cool with *sauśīlya* and beautiful with gentle waves of *kṛpā* (grace). This pond is fit to be entered into by all for ablutions and is the eternal abode of Lakṣmī.

The Lord is "our very life" (*asmad-asavaḥ*) and He is sitting on the *siṁhāsana* along with Lakṣmī and Bhūmi. He is ruling over the entire universe. His great compassion for all the living beings can be vouchsafed by His abiding in the hearts of all people. His *sauhṛda* (friendship) and goodwill are characterised by His independence (*svātantrya*) and all these features are wonderfully suggested by His physical stance from the feet upto the crown (śl. 64-67).

In another delightful metaphor the poet identifies the Lord with a beautiful ever-green *pārijāta*-tree which has come down to the earth from heaven. Its "fresh youth" manifests itself in all the ten directions and it forms the support and abode for the two *kalpa*-creepers, namely, Lakṣmī and Bhūmi. The tree is bent low under the weight of the fruits in the form of the innumerable boons meant for the devotees. "May this tree remove my fatigue of worldly existence," aspires Parāśara (śl. 68).

The gentle smile and the charming side-glances which bring everybody under the benevolent control of the Lord create the impression on the onlookers that He is speaking to them. Addressing the people at large the *abhayahasta* of Lord Raṅganātha seems to imply this idea: "These hands carrying the conch, mace and the discus bring you all welfare, and this pair of lotus-feet should be resorted to by you and it confers upon you prosperity and safety." The smiling face of the Lord seems to expound this idea for the benefit of the people (śl. 70).

In another verse Parāśara addresses the Lord as

Śrīraṅgaśṛṅgāra which means that the Lord is the very embodiment of all charm and beauty. This verse offers a running commentry, as it were, on the Lord's "movements" up and down the streets of Śrīraṅgam in the course of festival processions (as the *utsavabera*). His glances are full of affection for the devotees and the gentle smile on His lips conquers everybody by its inherent benevolence. His words are cool in the sense that they offer hope to those afflicted by the worldly miseries. His handsome figure is the target, as it were, (*śaravyam*) of the heart of Lakṣmī. His movements are a delight to the eyes. "What else is needed for a devotee to feast upon?" wonders Parāśara (śl. 72). His magnificent crown, brilliant *tilaka*-mark, large lotus-eyes, beautiful ears, broad chest, arms wielding weapons, the splendid knot of the dress at the waist and the lotus-feet draw everybody to the Lord. An ardent devotee like Parāśara aspires for the vision of the Lord of such a description wherever he casts his glances with a sincere prayer that he may have this experience for a hundred autumns (śl. 73-74).

Being attended upon by Śrī and Bhūmi on either side, by Garuḍa in front and Śeṣa in the rear, Lord Raṅganātha with His four arms sporting weapons and gesticulating *abhaya*- (asylum) seems to make His intention clear to everyone that He is ever ready to protect all and that there need be no fear or doubt in their hearts (śl. 75). The poet then resorts to the Lord who is like a *Kalpa*-tree as well as the *Kāmadhenu* for the devotees, the very consummation of all the prosperity of his humble self. He prays to the Lord to bless him and confer upon him the good fortune of serving Him for a long time. The Lord who is reclining in the Śrīraṅgam-temple on the soft, fragrant and broad

serpent-couch seems to be swinging gently in a cradle whenever Ādiśeṣa contracts and expands his body by his exhalations and inhalations (śl. 77). Lord Raṅganātha is the Supreme Being who can put an end to all the woes of the people who resort to Him. He is the one who appeared as the child on the banyan leaf and in the womb of Devakī, on the crown of the *Veda-s,* on the breasts of Kamalā, in the words of Śaṭhakopa and now visible in the *sanctum sanctorum* of the Śrīraṅgam temple.

In another beautiful verse (śl. 79) Parāśara describes in his own characteristic style, the *Yoganidrā* of Lord Raṅganātha. The Lord has completely forgotten His milky ocean, His highest abode (Śrī Vaikuṇṭha) and is now "engaged to Nidrā" in the place of Lakṣmī. It is very refreshing to note that Parāśara is fancying Nidrā to be another consort of Lord Raṅganātha with whom He is spending some time.

In the dark interior of the temple the Lord who is Himself bluish in complexion appears like an ocean drunk in by a cloud; as a mountain placed in an ocean; and also as an elephant sleeping on a bushy mountainous slope. In another interesting verse Parāśara calls Raṅganātha "the child of an ocean" (*arṇavatarṇaka*). A child always reclines on the bed and so does this child who is called *Śrīraṅgeśaya.* This Child in accordance with His parental characteristics, has coral-like lower lip, feet and hands. He is being fondled by Mother Kāverī with her wavy arms. "Remarkable indeed is this wonderful Child," points our author (śl. 81). "Raṅganātha" is a cool dark cloud illumined by the lightning in the form of Lakṣmī and adorned by a rainbow created by the rays emanating from the gems of His ornaments. This cloud is full with the waters of compassion. "May this

cloud sanctify me by its showers," prays Parāśara (śl. 82).

The Lord is fancied as a stream of nectar gratifying the eyes of the devotees and then as the celestial garden *nandana* in which Goddess Lakṣmī sports. The feet, hands and the face of Raṅganātha are the lotuses: His bodily complexion stands for the *Tāpiñcha*-trees and the lower lip corresponds to the *Bandhujīva*-flowers (śl. 83-84).

The complexion of the Lord is comparable to the *marakata* (emerald); His natural fragrance is enhanced by the sweet-smelling exhalations of Ādiśeṣa. His tenderness (*saukumārya*), personal charm (*lāvaṇya*), youthfulness (*yuvatvam*) brilliance, spectacular gem-studded crown with the central Cūḍāmaṇi and His beautiful face, the forehead covered by gentle locks of hair and brilliant with the *ūrdhvapuṇḍra* - all receive the devoted attention of our poet (śl. 85-95).

In a remarkable verse Parāśara compares the dark eye-brows of the Lord to two rows of dark bees engaged in a gentle dance, which are celebrating their victory over two lotuses which they have ultimately "brought down" that is, the eyes of the Lord (śl. 96). In the succeeding verse the poet continues to describe the Lord's eyebrows. They must be a pair of Manmatha's sugarcane bows fully bent because there are two flowery shafts below. Further the *Śārṅga*-bow of the Lord which is known for its remarkable "art of dance" must have had its schooling under these eyebrows. The large lotus-like eyes of the Lord which are full of compassion make one feel that all parts of the Lord's body are constituted of only one sense-organ, namely the eye. Cool with compassion and slightly red and white in tinge, the eyes of the Lord excel the *śaphara*-fish in their flashful glitter.

The glances that emanate from them are full of nectarine compassion. Calm and cool, they appear to be enquiring the welfare of those who bow down. "May these glances grace me," wishes the poet (śl. 98 - 100).

The beautiful nose of the Lord is like the *Kalpaka*-creeper; the smile is the beautiful flower that has blossomed on it. The chin and the cheeks are the tender leaves of the creeper (śl. 101). The ear-ornaments of the Lord, His handsome face, neck, hands and lotus-like palms are again described by the poet in a picturesque manner (śl. 102-109). These hands which normally serve Lakṣmī as pillows (*upadhāna*) have a remarkable feature about them. The right hand which Lord Raṅganātha is resting under His head as a pillow in fact touches the crown and it seems to confirm that the Lord is superior to the rest of the deities, since crown is the symbol of supremacy. The other hand stretched over His left knee seems to point to the lotus-foot as the chief goal of all human endeavour (śl. 110). The Lord's chest then receives a wonderful description. The chest is the pleasure-house of Lakṣmī painted with sandal paste, spread over by *Mālatī*-gardens serving the purpose of a couch. The gem necklaces act as the canopy and the *Kaustubha* serves the purpose of an auspicious lamp. The chest of the Lord is also adorned by innumerable sculptures in the form of deep etchings carved out by chisels namely the horns of bulls in the form of demons (śl. 111).

The chest of Lord Raṅganātha itself declares His Supreme Lordship by such characteristics as the *Tulasī*-garland, the presence of Lakṣmī, the *Kaustubha*-gem and the *Vaijayantī*-garland. Be it as it may, the ornaments which Yaśodā herself put on the

Lord's chest (around the neck of child Kṛṣṇa) such as the *Pañcāyudhahārā*[86a] along with the nails of tortoise and tiger is itself capable of attracting us to the Lord without any fear of His transcendental prowess (*paratva*) (śl. 113).

The navel of the Lord, the three folds on the belly and the scar left on His tender waist when He was tied by Yaśodā with a rope, and the lotus that has sprung from His navel, being the source of Brahmā, all these point again to the Lord's supremacy over other deities (śl. 114-117).

Adequate reference is also made to the thighs, the yellow silk garment, knees, calves and the lotus-feet of the Lord. His feet seem to have acquired their red tinge from the palms of Lakṣmī engaged in shampooing them[87] (śl. 118-123).

In the last three verses of this first century, the poet eulogises the lotus-feet of the Lord which are also likened to tender leaves. Identifying Lord Raṅganātha with Kṛṣṇa the poet loses himself in a thrilling recollection of some events of Kṛṣṇa's life. These are the feet which were adept in running about in the Bṛndāvana in His sports with Gopikā-s, which danced to the sounds of the churning of curds,[88] which are the sole witness of the bliss of being shampooed by Lakṣmī's hands, which did not distinguish between the high and low and mixed freely with all and which went to the Kaurava's court with a message of love and peace. "May these feet bring auspiciousness unto us", prays our poet (śl. 124). The marks that these feet bear such as *Vajra* and *Dhvaja* clearly suggest the supreme lordship of Raṅganātha. The radiance emanating from the nails and fingers on the feet of the Lord which are like fresh bunches of tender

sprouts issuing from the Kalpa-trees, sanctify the whole world by the "streams of Ganges" that flows from them (śl. 125-126). These feet are again worshipped with golden lotuses by Śrī Rāma and His consort Sītā (śl. 127).

UTTARAŚATAKA

As pointed out earlier this century of verses (105 verses) explains the import of the second half of the *dvayamantra,* which according to tradition, points to the Lord as the goal of all human endeavour and as the master (*śeṣin*) whom the entire universe of *acit* and *cit* subserves.

After a brief statement highlighting the importance of *māna* (*pramāṇa,* the valid means of knowledge) as a gift of God to humanity with which one could distinguish between good and bad or between existing and non-existing entities and also dispel darkness (ignorance), Parāśara observes that non-Vedic schools and similar other systems do not really deliver the goods. The view of the *bāhya*-s is avoided by the orthodox since it contradicts not only *pratyakṣa* but also *śruti* which is free from all defects. Further, such schools are vitiated by the usual errors of human agency and derive their authority from irrational logic (śl. 1-3). The Cārvāka believes in *pratyakṣa* only and does not believe in the existence of the soul beyond the body. The soul is referred to as *aham* and is distinct from the body, senses, etc. It is referred to normally as 'this' (*idam*). The confusion involving the identification of the body and soul arises because of their close association. It is only such an individual soul that becomes a qualified aspirant to perform the rites such as *jyotiṣṭoma* ordained by sacred texts (śl. 4). Strictly speaking, Parāśara argues that even the Cārvāka who

relies upon *pratyakṣa* alone should accept *śruti* and its meaning as matters of *pratyakṣa.* That is to say that even the scriptures can become an object of audible perception (*śrāvaṇa-pratyakṣa*). Even as the objects of *pratyakṣa* are not sublatable, so also the ideas conveyed by *śruti* such as *dharma, adharma* and Īśvara are not subject to any contradiction. Therefore *śruti* also should be taken as a valid means of perception along with *pratyakṣa.* Or, if the Cārvāka can sit in yogic contemplation he would see for himself all these matters through such a perception (śl. 5).

As for the Buddhists (Saugata) who try to deny the reality of everything without accepting any particular locus (*nirupadhi*), Parāśara condemns them outright for their peculiar logical position. According to the Mādhyamika school the universe is neither existent (*sat*) nor non-existent (*asat*), nor both (*sadasat*), nor even something beyond *sadasat* (*anubhayātmaka*). The idea implied here is that one who denies everything (*sarvam*) is contradicting himself because even his statement *sarvam nāsti* becomes subject to this refutation. Further even if he refutes the reality of the universe as pertaining to some substratum, (*sādhiṣṭhāna*), it results in his accepting the existence of the world elsewhere. To cite an example, when the pot is broken, its shreds still continue to exist. The other Buddhistic schools such as Yogācāra, Sautrāntika and Vaibhāṣika which speak of the non-existence of the universe, the inferential nature of the universe and the momentariness of everything respectively, are also refuted by Parāśara in the three succeeding verses. These three schools notwithstanding their apparent differences, have two things in common: (a) that knowledge alone forms the self, and (b) that everything is momentary. But this cannot be accepted

when there is no abiding self as the possessor of cognitions. Since the objects of knowledge and the knowledge itself gets destroyed in a moment, one cannot account for *smṛti* (recollection) and *pratyabhijñā* (recognition). Moreover, when we have a cognition and make the judgement *aham idam abhivedmi* ("I know this"), one can notice the difference between the knower and the knowledge. But the Buddhists declare that all objects of cognition are unreal. Then even this cognition of the Buddhist becomes unreal and the ultimate result would be that all objects are real, which is the view of the Viśiṣṭādvaitin himself.

In the following verse a reference is made to the view of the Advaitin whom Parāśara nicknames *Kalibrahmamīmāṁsaka*-s. According to them, Brahman is pure knowledge which is unqualified and self-luminous. Still it becomes subject to transmigration due to its own *avidyā* or *māyā.* The *jīva* who has realised the truth of the *abheda*-texts such as *tat tvamasi*[89] can alone get itself removed of the illusion under which Brahman is smarting. Therefore, they have tried to prove that whatever is visible is unreal. To them also Parāśara gives the same reply that even the statement that "everything other than Brahman is unreal" becomes a predicate of such a negation. Ultimately the reality of the world becomes established (śl. 11).

In the succeeding verse, Parāśara ridicules the Jaina-view which tries to prove the "inconclusiveness" (*anekāntatā*) of the ultimate reality through their characteristic logic involving seven steps (*saptabhaṅgī*). There is also the *Bhedābheda* school advocated by Bhāskara which admits both difference and non-difference between Brahman and the world on the basis of an *upādhi* such as a body. This is as ridiculous as a statement, "my mother is a barren woman." Both these schools,

adds Parāśara, sail in the same boat and are to be set aside (śl. 12).

Parāśara also refers to the *Nyāya* and the *Vaiśeṣika* school which do not accept the Supreme Being as the material cause (*upādāna-karaṇa*) of the universe, but speak of the atoms (*paramāṇu*) themselves as the material cause. According to them all products come into existence without any reference to any Supreme Being. This is a strange and unfortunate situation in so far as the Naiyāyika-s are concerned, points Parāśara. In other words there is no reason why they should ignore the Vedāntic declaration that Brahman alone is the *upādana*, and the *nimittakāraṇa* of the universe (śl. 13).

The *Vedāntic* view is that the Veda-s are *apauruṣeya* and that they are recollected and uttered by the Lord Himself from time to time. This itself imparts a pre-eminent position to the *Veda-s* as the highest authority on which are based all other texts. The fifth *Veda*, namely the *Mahābhārata* itself declares that schools like the *Sāṅkhya, Yoga* and *Pāśupata* are valid only in part and the *Pāñcarātra*, being the spoken word of the Lord Himself, is valid *in toto* (śl. 14).

Parāśara briefly alludes to the concept of Īśvara or some such principle in other schools such as Sāṁkhya, Yoga and Pāśupata and concludes that Viṣṇu's supremacy is clear enough through His *para, vyūha, vibhava* and other aspects as described in the *Pāñcarātra* texts. Parāśara also states that he does not care a bit for the Buddhistic philosophy although it is believed to have been expounded by Lord Viṣṇu Himself after assuming the form[89a] a of (*Māyā*) *Mohana* (śl. 15-16), since it is meant to mislead the evil-minded persons.

Turning to the question of Vedic authority, Parāśara explains the impersonal character of the *Veda*-s. At the

end of every *kalpa* the Lord retains the Vedic texts in the form of *saṁskāra*-s (latent impressions) and at the time of creation He recollects and teaches them to Brahmā. That is why the *Veda*-s are without any authorship and this accounts for their authority. According to Parāśara the six *aṅga-s* of the *Veda*-s such as *Śikṣā, Vyākaraṇa, Chandas* etc., and sciences like *Nyāya* and *Mīmāṁsā* and the *Smṛti-s* and *Purāṇa-s* follow the Vedic authority and form effective means of realising the goal of life (śl. 17-18).

The *Veda*-s are of utmost authority. Of decreasing order of importance are *Smṛti-s, Itihāsa-s, Purāṇa-s, Nyāya* and the like. The entire *Pūrvabhāga* of the *Veda* and the subsidiary texts constitute the means of worshipping the Lord. The latter part of the *Veda*-s, that is, the *Upaniṣad*-s speaks at length about the object or the goal of worship, namely, the Lord Himself, possessed of innumerable auspicious qualities, of unsurpassed glory and unfailing will. This point has been elaborated by Lord Kṛṣṇa in the *Gītā* itself.[90]

Parāśara is of the firm opinion that neither the performance of sacrifices, nor their latent power, nor the *apūrva* that arises, nor even the grace of the manes and minor gods bring the results desired by the performers of those acts. He is thereby refuting the views of Bhāṭṭa-s and Prābhākara-s. The orthodox view, however is that the performance of the *japa*-s, *homa*-s, etc., known as *iṣṭa* and acts such as constructing temples, tanks, etc., known as *pūrta* ultimately bear fruit only by the Lord's grace and not by any other extraneous factors. Even these very acts constitute the command of the Lord (śl. 20). Parāśara further points out that the *nitya* and *naimittika* (obligatory and occassional) rites of the *Veda*-s are known as the *ājñāvidhi*-s (commandments), and the

kāmya-injunctions are known as the *anujñāvidhi*-s (permitted rites). There are also rites which are called the *abhicāra*-s meant to attract even the most stubborn people to the fold of Vedic authority (by pointing out the ways and means of attaining wealth, control over persons, etc). The entire *śruti* is meant for the ultimate welfare of the people and brings out the intention of the Lord who is always bent upon protecting the creatures. Thus the *Veda* is the eternal command of the Lord (śl. 21).

In the succeeding verse Parāśara refutes the Prābhākara view that words indicating already existing entities (*siddha-vastu*) do not gain validity. This is so because all Vedic texts should be construed in such a way that they point to a '*kārya* (something to be accomplished).[91] Therefore, strictly speaking, the Upaniṣadic portions of the *Veda*-s which speak of Brahman, an already existing entity, cannot be primarily valid. They should be converted as injunctions so as to gain validity.[92]

This view is refuted by Parāśara, by saying that even sentences speaking of already existing entities are valid in their own right. Thus for instance if a reliable person tells somebody that there is a treasure in a particular place (*"atrāste nidhiḥ"*), this statement becomes valid although it refers to an already existing entity, namely, treasure. Therefore, there is no justification in the Mīmāṁsāka's denying the validity of *siddhaparavākya*-s. Parāśara further asserts that Upaniṣadic passages such as *satyaṁ jñānam anantam brahma*[93] and *yaḥ sarvajñaḥ sarvavit*[94] which speak of the innumerable virtues, character and form of the Lord, should be given their due validity. It is obvious that Parāśara is following here Rāmānuja's commentary on the *Brahmasūtra* - *tattu*

Parāśara observes next that the interpretation of the *Chāndogya* passage *ekamevādvitīyam*[95] cannot prove the unreality of the universe. The entire universe forms the inseparable attribute of the Lord even as the body belongs to the soul, the modifications (effects) pertain to the cause and *jāti* (the universal) *guṇa*-s (qualities) and *karman* (action) depend upon a substance (*dravya*). All these give rise to specific mental cognitions and verbal references. Thus the word *advitīya* (without a second) in particular, does not on any interpretation, deny the existence of the world of *cit* and *acit* which forms the mode of the Lord. In other words, in both the subtle (*sūkṣma*) and the gross (*sthūla*) states, that is, before and after creation, the universe remains as the body of the Lord. That being the case, the theories of *māyā* (accounting for the unreality of the universe), *upādhi* (limiting adjunct causing apparent distinctions in Brahman) and *vikāra* (that Brahman undergoes essential modification) all get sublated. These three theories are those of Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and Yādavaprakāśa respectively (śl. 23).

In the next verse Parāśara shows the proper way of interpreting the texts which speak of non-difference (*abheda*) between Brahman and the world. These are the passages meant here: *sarvaṁ khalvidam brahma,*[96] *aitadātmyamidaṁ sarvam*[97] and *tattvamasi.*[98] These passages speak of the non-difference between Brahman and the universe including the *jīva* because everything forms the body of the Lord, being controlled by Him, pervaded by Him (supported) and being subservient to Him. The Lord's control over the universe is evident by His creating, sustaining and destroying the universe. Therefore, the *Chāndogya* passage in question speaks of the identity between Brahman and the universe, by

the principle of co-ordinate predication (*sāmānādhikaraṇya*),[99] since even in common parlance the body and the soul are referred to as identical (*ahaṁ sthūlaḥ* etc.) (śl. 24).

The author then refers to the views of the Naiyāyika-s who try to prove the existence of a Supreme Designer-Architect for this universe through reasoning alone, (who ultimately turns out to be an efficient cause), the view of the Mīmāṁsaka-s who do not accept any such Being as a master of the universe and the view of others who speak of the "trinity of gods" as equals, and again the theory of those that Rudra or Hiraṇyagarbha or such other gods are the masters of the universe. All these views, points out Parāśara, are set aside by the *śruti* itself which speaks of Lord Viṣṇu alone as the ruler of both *cit* and *acit*. The *śruti*-s - *eko ha vai nārāyaṇa āsīt*,[100] *patiṁ viśvasya*[101] and so on, make it clear that all other gods are bound by *karman* and as such they cannot be the rulers of the universe. They further clarify that these gods are of varying degrees of powers so much so they cannot be called Supreme (śl. 25). Other gods like Brahmā and Śiva, argues Parāśara, form part of the creation itself and they act according to the dictates of Nārāyaṇa, as declared by *śruti*-s.[102] Further these gods are not known to have manifested themselves through *avatāra*-s like Viṣṇu.[103] Therefore, they cannot be equated with Lord Nārāyaṇa. Nārāyaṇa is therefore the unquestioned monarch of the universe in association with His consort Lakṣmī (śl. 26).

In the following verses Parāśara explains the six perfections such as *jñāna* (knowledge), *śakti* (power), *bala* (strength), *aiśvarya* (lordship), *vīrya* (energy) and *tejas* (effulgence), which always abide by the Lord in an unsurpassed manner, and which make Him Bhagavān[104]

(śl. 27-34). While explaining the quality called *aiśvarya,* Parāśara takes occasion to criticise the Sāṅkhya theory of the evolution of the universe. According to this, *prakṛti* which is inert and insentient (*ajña*) itself is the source of the universe and the Puruṣa by his mere presence as a *sākṣin* (witness)[105] provides the necessary stimulus for creation, etc. But Parāśara points out that the quality *aiśvarya* (lordship) which facilitates the cosmic functions such as creation, etc., is present in the Lord. Therefore, the Sāṅkhya view cannot satisfactorily explain the creation of the universe.

Parāśara also observes that the *Ānandavallī*-section of the *Taittirīyopaniṣad* waxes eloquent about the attributes of the Lord such as youthfulness, bliss and the like starting from the humans and ending up with Brahmā, the creator. Still the *upaniṣad* in question is unable to bring out the glory of the Lord in all its fulness. It ends up like a dumb creature. As such, what to speak of the powers of the mind and speech of a human in comprehending the virtues of the Supreme?[106] Such divine qualities which are beyond the human ken, thought and speech including softness, skill, affection and forgiveness, are treasured *as it were* in the Āraṇyaka- like precious gems. They can now be seen and felt here in the iconic form of Lord Raṅganātha at Śrīraṅgam, which is so to speak, a veritable jewellery, remarks Parāśara (śl. 36).

The author also refers to the theory of *Vyūha*-s of the *Pāñcarātra* according to which, the four *Vyūha* manifestations of the Lord with different functions and characteristics facilitate the meditational exercises of the devotees (śl. 37-40). Referring to the remarkable compassion of the Lord, Parāśara observes that but for His grace, creation itself would not have taken place. Creation lies in uniting the souls of beings with proper

bodies and senses since at the time of *pralaya* all the souls exist Undistinguishable from inanimate matter. By His free will the Lord made the *prakṛti* modify and produce *mahat, ahaṁkāra* and the *indriya*-s (śl. 41). Cruelty and partiality cannot be attributed to the Lord if we find the world in which we live, full of inequality and misery. The peculiar past acts (*karman*) performed by the individuals in their previous births should alone be held responsible for their misery or happiness in the present life. The *Brahmasūtra* and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka upaniṣad* are in support of this view.[107] (śl. 42).

Parāśara here anticipates the objection that the Lord's dependence on the past *karma*-s of the individual souls does not contribute to His independence. Parāśara answers by citing four analogies: (1) The agent of an action such as a potter, is independent in so far as the production of the pot is concerned, although he has to depend upon a number of auxiliaries like water, wheel, stick, etc., (2) A person who enjoys certain comforts of the physical world is also deemed to be independent regarding the enjoyment, notwithstanding his dependence on his own physical body; (3) A ruler is considered to be independent in matters of favouring or punishing his dependents although he has to depend upon the behaviour of the people concerned; and (4) A donor who is willing to offer gifts upon the needy and is thus independent, still has to depend upon those people who come to him. In other words his quality of charity becomes meaningless if nobody comes to him for favour. Still this cannot be construed as impairing the independence of the donor. In the same manner, the independence of the Supreme Being cannot be supposed to be undermined although He acts according to the *karman* of the beings concerned (śl. 43).

The poet-philosopher Parāśara, then explains the process of creation itself. The Lord projects and manifests by His own free will, the *cit* and *acit* entities which form an infinitesimal part of His own body, which during the cosmic dissolution, lie dormant. This is compared to a peacock sportingly spreading forth his beautiful plumes dancing in glee, in the presence of his mate. The Lord also sports in this manner in the presence of His consort Śrī. The idea underlying here is that the essential nature, power and glory of the Supreme are not exhausted by the process of creation. It is just a sport for Him implying the total independence and disinterestedness with which He carries on the cosmic functions (śl. 44).

Parāśara then speaks of the remarkable compassion of the Lord in manifesting Himself in the world of mortals for their welfare. Time and again He is very much concerned with what may even be described as an over-enthusiasm to put the violaters of *dharma* on the right path. Parāśara drives home this point with the very apt analogy of a mother who swallows portions of bitter medicine so that her suckling child may become healthier (śl. 45).

The Lord's excessive love and consideration for the universe full of unwise people is evident from every episode of His incarnations. Undaunted, He again and again tries to woo them to the path of virtue. This is like the setting in of the cycle of seasons which contributes to the wefare of the beings, and which can be inferred by the seasonal traits (śl. 46).

Parāśara then answers the question as to how the Lord's compassion and friendliness to the living beings could be justified when it is known that He punishes the guilty. The author points out that punishing the

evil-minded is itself an act of favour extended to them for their own well-being (śl. 47).

Parāśara observes that the Lord time and again incarnates Himself for the protection of all the beings taking such forms as celestials, mortals and even animals although He Himself is birthless. An important feature of the Lord's incarnations is that His consort Indirā accompanies Him in all His manifestations assuming appropriate forms and functions. The Lord's nature and will and the cause and purpose behind the series of His manifestations are highly inscrutable. Only the wise can understand them, while the ignorant consider the Lord as a mere mortal and speak ill of Him (śl. 48-50).

Parāśara ridicules the theory which holds Viṣṇu to be equal with Brahmā and Śiva, all forming the trinity of Gods. If Viṣṇu who is the central figure of the trinity were to be treated like that, then what purpose would be served by such activities of the Lord as promoting the quality of *sattva,* showering compassion on and coming to the rescue of those who are in distress? These activities are the unmistakable signs of the Supremacy of the Lord, observes our author (śl. 51). Parāśara then enters into a long and eloquent eulogy of the *avatāra*-s (*vibhava*-s) the Lord took from time to time to protect the virtuous and to punish the vile. The *avatāra*-s described are: *Hayagrīva* (śl. 52), *Haṁsa* (śl. 53), *Vaṭapatraśāyin* (śl. 54), *Matsya* (śl. 60-61), *Kūrma* (śl. 62), *Varāha (śl. 63), Narasiṁha* (śl. 64-66), *Vāmana* (śl. 67), *Paraśurāma* (śl. 68), *Śrīrāma* (śl. 69), *Kṛṣṇa* (śl. 70-72) and *Kalkin* (śl. 73). Of these special reference has to be made to Parāśara's attachment to the Gajendravarada-form (which is not treated canonically as a separate incarnation), Narasiṁha and Śrīkṛṣṇa *avatāra-s.* As soon as Lord Viṣṇu heard the trumpeting of the elephant made in great agony,

He quickly took away His feet from the lotus-hands of His two consorts which were stroking them, left the serpent-bed, enlarged His lotus-eyes whose lids were extremely unsteady, wiped out from His chest the saffron-marks left by embracing Lakṣmī and started out in a huff (śl. 56). The great hurry in which the Lord dashed out of His abode to save the elephant is vividly described by the poet in another beautiful verse: The Lord was in such a tremendous 'confusion' and hurry that He did not hold the hand of Viṣvaksena stretched out for support, nor did He put on the gem-studded sandals. He left all the inmates of the harem in utter dismay as to what had happened to Him. Without even having the seat properly bedecked, He sat on Garuda's back. "Salutations to such a hurried condition of the Lord" exclaims our poet. As the Lord sat on his back, Garuḍa increased his extraordinary speed to a tremendous degree of velocity. Still the Lord felt that it was not fast enough and began to shout, splash him on his back and even kick at his sides with a view to making him go faster. Even after Garuḍa had increased his speed further, the Lord Himself felt it inadequate and began to lift and push him up in a frantic bid... all this to save Gajendra at the earliest moment. The poet wonders at this unique compassion of the Lord and exclaims "O Lord! when anybody just prostrates before you, you will be in utter panic!" In such a state of utter excitement and anxiety, the poet notes in another verse, the Lord put on His ornaments, garlands and silken dress in a disorderly manner, and began to blame Himself aloud "Alas! fie upon me." In this situation He resembled a lotus-pond deeply perturbed by powerful currents of wind (śl. 59).

Parāśara fancies that the man-lion (*Nara-siṁha*) form of the Lord which combines in itself wonderful and charming features in such a way that this form is no longer avoided or abhorred by people. When seen separately, the human and leonine forms normally cannot be admired by anyone. Therefore, the Lord had, by a stroke of His genius, brought these two features together as *nara-siṁha* and made it a pleasant and charming combination as that of milk and sugar, much to the delight of His devotees. The poet further observes that in His man-lion incarnation the Lord actually dispensed with His enemy effortlessly with the tip of His nails. But His fury against Hiraṇyakaśipu, who harassed His devotee Prahlāda in the most unbecoming manner knew no bounds. As such His physical body grew twice the size of His cosmic form as Viṣṇu. The man-lion form which He assumed thus in all haste, still provided a matchless co-ordination between the human and animal forms (śl. 64-66).

Losing himself in the glories of Rāmāvatāra, the poet feels that the disappearance of Sītā (at Citrakūṭa) and her 'hiding' in Aśokavana was a mere sport. The poet wonders as to why the Lord had to undergo enormous pain and strain in building a bridge across the ocean and in putting an end to the demon who was puffed up by the boons he got from Brahmā and Śiva. The poet's opinion is that Śītā, had she so desired, could have easily foiled Rāvaṇa's plans of seizing her. But still she allowed all this to happen and this must have been with a definite purpose behind (śl. 68-69).

Parāśara then describes in two verses the greatest of all the incarnations of the Lord, that is Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In a touching reference to Kṛṣṇa's mother Devakī he says that she wanted the Supreme Brahman as her child.

This Supreme Brahman is the one whose complexion is of the rainy cloud which being full with water is slow to move; He is the one draped in yellow silk, one who has lotus-eyes and five weapons. The characteristics pertain to Viṣṇu alone. "Which other woman would desire such a child?" wonders the author (śl. 70-71). In the next verse the poet brings out in a unique way the amazing and sweeping influence of the sweet notes of Kṛṣṇa's magic flute on the entire universe of *cit* and *acit.* What more, even Kṛṣṇa was no exception to the dulcet music that emanated from His own fantastic flute.[107a] The sweetness of the music that flowed from the flute had rendered the entire creation different from what it originally was. Mountains and fires became soft and cool respectively; sages became stupefied; the immobile trees and ignorant cowherds became highly enlightened; the mighty venomous serpents brimmed with nectar; even tigers and cows became fraternal, the rest underwent transformation and even Kṛṣṇa was one amongst them. This was what happened when the music of the Lord's flute swept through the entire creation with its ravishing and inebriating sweetness (śl. 72).

What follows then is the glorification of the iconic form (*arcā*) of the Lord which forms the most easily accessible of the five-fold forms of Lord Viṣṇu - the remaining four being *Para, Vyūha, Vibhava* and *Anatyāmin.* It is true that all incarnations of the Lord are magnanimous, grand and motivated by unconditional love for the creatures. But what is more striking is the Lord's willingness to come down to the mortal plane and animate the idols installed in temples built on earth, putting up with all inconveniences, and depending totally upon the *arcaka*-s (the worshippers) for His very sustenance. How deep and how great is the Lord's concern

for His ardent devotees! The grateful lovers of God are thrilled and dumb-founded at this remarkable gesture of the Supreme Lord (śl. 74)

While an ardent devotee whole-heartedly believes in the all-pervasive presence and grace of the Lord, the *arcāvatāra* comes in quite handy to spiritualise His mortal existence. The *Para, Vyūha,* and the *Vibhava* aspects, it is quite obvious, are an impossible hope for the suffering humanity. It is therefore out of supreme consideration for man that the Lord has condescended as an *arcā* which assures salvation to one and all (*viśvajanīna*). The present *arcā* in the holy temple of Śrīraṅgam welcomes everyone and enquires about their welfare with its beatific and beautiful glances imbued by wonderful grace (śl. 75).

Parāśara also refers to the age-old mythological tradition associated with the worship of Lord Raṅganātha at Śrīraṅgam. According to the legends Brahmā the creator-god, bathed in the celestial Ganges and worshipped Lord Ranganātha offering lotuses at His feet. The idol of Lord Raṅganātha was being worshipped by the ancestors of Śrī Rāma starting from Manu. Rāma Himself worshipped the idol along with His wife Sītā.[108] The poet also makes mention of the episode of the Lord abiding at Śrīraṅgam itself in accordance with the desire of Vibhīṣaṇa[109] (śl. 76-78).

The succeeding four verses (śl. 79-82) describe Lord Raṅganātha employing Upaniṣadic statements such as *tatsaviturvareṇyam,*[110] *āpraṇakhātsarva eva suvarṇaḥ*[111] *cakṣurmitrasya varuṇasya...*[112] *yasyāsmi na tamantaremi*[113] *āyuḥ prajānām,*[114] etc.

Parāśara then speaks of the glories of the Lord employing the words and ideas expressed in the *Bhagavad*

Gītā such as *ārto jijñāsuḥ,*[115] *mayi sarvāṇi karmāṇi,*[116] etc. (śl. 83-84). Those who realise their own self through *samādhi* as the twenty-fifth category, over and above the well-known twenty-four categories, and unite it with itself, attain the *kaivalya* state. However those who realise their self in its true nature as the twenty-fifth category and unites it with the Supreme Self become liberated (śl. 85). Those who were completely devoid of the influence of their past *karman* and are by their very birth bent upon serving the Lord out of spontaneous and motiveless love, sing the glories of the Lord, think of Him and salute Him. Such people live in the Lord and the Lord in turn lives in them (śl. 86).[117]

In the next verse Parāśara expresses his wholehearted surrender to the Lord. Upaniṣadic passages such as *yato vā imāni,*[118] *antaḥ praviṣṭaḥ śāstā*[119] and *patiṁ viśvasya*[120] declares that the Lord along with His consort is responsible for the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the entire universe of men and matter and that they are all subservient to Him. To be the means of salvation and the goal of all human effort constitutes the very nature and truth of Lord's existence. They are not two different qualities. That is why the poet says that he is resorting to the Lord without any reservation (śl. 87). The poet then refers to the independence of the Lord in conferring *mokṣa* on a soul or throwing it into the endless cycle of *saṁsāra.* "Who is to question you? You alone should save me," appeals the poet (śl. 88).

The author then realises his utter non-eligibility even to utter the words "I surrender before the Lord." He is totally ignorant of *Karma-yoga, Jñāna-yoga* and *Bhakti-yoga.* Apart from the mere desire to be saved he has no other qualification. He is in a confused state of mind, and hence this appeal (śl. 89).

In a number of verses taking us from verse 90 to the last verse of this *stava* the poet gives expression to the remarkable qualities of the Lord such as compassion and omnipotence, and to his own ignoble qualities, sinful activities, materialistic tendencies, egoity, self-imposed status as a spiritual teacher and the like which all correspond to *Kārpaṇya* ("utter helplessness"), which constitutes *naicyānusandhāna* of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition. But the grace of the Lord is so magnanimous and overwhelming that it would certainly forgive the sins of even the most abominable sinner. The poet puts a very clever question: "Did your grace contract, O Lord! due to its association with such sinners as the crow-demon (*kākāsura*) and Śisupāla?." The poet also reminds the Lord of the vow which He took that He would offer protection to whosoever surrenders to Him but once and offers himself to Him.[121] (śl. 90-101). The poet places his burden at the feet of the Lord, being prompted by *ācārya*-s and categorically states, "O Lord! you are my refuge." The Lord therefore cannot brush side the appeal of the ardent devotee.

In a beautiful verse involving the figure of speech *Vyājastuti,* Parāśara points out, that strictly speaking the qualities of the Lord such as *dayā* (compassion), *kṣamā* (forgiveness) and *audārya* (magnanimity) do not have any role or function. "Compassion" consists in being unable to bear the misery of others. The Lord Himself being everything else and everybody else, where is the scope for the display of His grace? "Forgiveness" means winking at the faults of others. This too is rendered ineffective by the fact that the Lord is always unaware of the faults of others. When the faults of others are themselves not known to the Lord where is the occasion for His forgiving them? Likewise even the "magnanimity"

of the Lord is something difficult to understand for, whatever the Lord has, has already been made over to his devotees,[123] (śl. 103) and there is no scope for anything else to be aspired for afresh (śl. 103).

The grace of the Lord is such that it elevates even the lowliest of the lowly. In fact the quality of Lordship lies in fulfilling the desires of the have-nots (śl. 104). There is also no virtue, remarks the poet in fine, if the Lord extends a helping hand to those who are already at a vantage point by virtue of their performance of the *karma* - *jñāna*- and *bhaktiyoga*-s. Helping such people will be like pouring water to a fish which is already in water (*mīnapānīyanaya*). But if the Lord comes to the rescue of hopeless persons like the poet, it would be a positive help, like putting up a water-tent in the midst of a desert (śl. 105).

TATTVARATNĀKARA

This monumental treatise of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is unfortunately not available to us although a number of fragments are available through the quotations of Vedānta Deśika in his *Nyāyapariśuddhi, Nyāyasiddhāñjana, Seśvaramīmāṁsā, Tattvamuktākalāpa* and *Tattvaṭīkā.* Of these the majority of quotations are from the first two works mentioned above. It is clear from these quotations that Parāśara covers the whole range of the *Nyāyaśāstra* and interprets several principles in the light of Viśiṣṭādvaita system of thought in this work. An attempt is made here to study these fragments to the extent they are available.[124]

The first quotation seeks to define and classify *saṁśaya* (doubt). It runs thus: "The cognition which apprehends several contradictory features with reference

to one and the same entity is known as doubt. It is two-fold." The part of the text which classifies *saṁśaya* is not available. But we can supply the idea from Vedānta Deśika's *Nyāyapariśuddhi.* According to this, *saṁśaya* is of two kinds: (1) That which is based on the common feature (*samānadharma*); and (2) that which is based on mutual discrepancy (*vipratipatti*). Looking at a tall object, and being unable to decide whether it is a man or post is the illustration for the first variety. When one looks in the mirror and sees the image of one's own face there arises the doubt regarding the reality of the reflection. This forms the illustration for the second variety.

The second quotation concerns itself with the number of *pramāṇa*-s. Parāśara points out that although those who rely upon the *Veda-s* mention *smṛti* (recollection), *pratyakṣa* (perception), *aitihya* (same as *āgama* or verbal testimony) and *anumāna* (inference) as the valid means of knowledge, all recollection (*smṛti*) based upon *pratyakṣa* etc., can actually be included in its own source. As such there is no difficulty in concluding that *pramāṇa*-s are three in number.

The third fragment defines the immediacy (*āparokṣyam*) of cognition. It consists in cognizing an object directly through *pratyakṣa.* This immediacy of knowledge distinguishes it from verbal and inferential cognitions. In other words fire, etc., are the objects concerning whose existence on a hill-top a man engages himself through the observation of smoke, etc., concomitant with that entity. The knowledge that arises therefrom is known as inference. If a person hears somebody mentioning the existence of fire at a particular place and believes that there is fire, purely on the strength of that statement, we have an instance of verbal cognition. In the same context the mediacy of knowedge (*pārokṣya*)

is the dependence on the knowledge of things which do not have a direct bearing upon the intention of the person involved. If a person wants to find out the existence of fire through smoke it constitutes his dependence on a thing (smoke) which is not actually the thing desired by him. Therefore, dependence on *liṅga* and *śabda* which do not actually belong to the category of the things desired, is what is known as *pārokṣya* or mediacy of cognitions.

The next fragment (4) records the ancient view regarding conjunction (*saṁyoga*). The conjunction between an object and the sense-organ is two-fold: *saṁyoga* and *saṁyuktāśraya.* The contact between the sense-organs and objects is known as *saṁyoga* (conjunction); the contact between the sense-organs and the colour, etc., of the objects is known as *saṁyuktāśrayaṇa* (dependence on that which is conjoined). It has to be pointed out that for the Viśiṣṭādvaitin-s *samavāya* (inherence), is not acceptable since it leads to infinite regress (*anavasthā*).[125] The quotation in question also says *yathāsambhavamūhyatām* meaning "this can be understood, depending upon possibility." By this Parāśara implies that in the case of direct perception of the *yogin*-s and in cases of *anyathākhyāti* (misapprehension), this kind of conjunction is not applicable.

The next quotation (5) explains the difference between the *savikalpaka* (determinate) and *nirvikalpaka* (indeterminate) *pratyakṣa* (perception). According to the Viśiṣṭādvaita school the indeterminate (*nirvikalpaka*) perception does not cognise an undifferentiated and unqualified object, as held by the Naiyāyika-s and Advaitin-s.[126] Even in this kind of perception the object is qualified by some attributes such as configuration, but it is devoid of "retrospection" (*anuvṛtti* or *pratyavamarśa*)

since it happens to be the first object of that kind of things cognized. In the determinate (*savikalpaka*) perception the qualities, etc., of the object are found to exist in other individuals of the same kind.[127]

The *Tattvaratnākara* passage states that in the *nirvikalpaka* perception one notices the "non-absence" (that is, presence) of "lack of relationship" of an object with its own genus (*jāti*), etc. Thus, in the perception of a cow for the first time, what one fails to notice is the continuity of the *jāti* (*gotva*) etc., in other individual cows. In the *savikalpaka* perception the cow is seen to be possessed of this genus (*gotva*) and as devoid of other kinds of *jāti* (*anyayogasya vyāvṛttiḥ*) such as *aśvatva, mahiṣatva,* etc.

Pratyakṣa again is two-fold: (1) that which belongs to the ancients (*anarvācina,* that is, Yogins or extraordinary persons) and (2) that which belongs to the recent ones, that is, ordinary people (*arvācīna*). The first kind of perception belongs to the *Yogin*-s, the released souls and the Supreme Being; it is capable of directly visualising all things at one and the same time. The expression *upapādayiṣyate* (will be explained later). indicates that this matter was further discussed in the later portion of the *Tattvaratnākara* which, however, is not traceable in the available fragments.

The subsequent fragment (6) represents an ancient view regarding *vyāpti* (invariable concomitance). According to this, the *vyāpti* between the *sādhana* (probans) and a *sādhya* (probandum) is grasped by a single observation. Later philosophers, however, insist that *vyāpti* can be obtained only through repeated observation. The word *sambandha* used by Parāśara in this quotation must be understood in the sense of

mere co-ordination (*sāmānādhikaraṇya*). According to Parāśara all concepts by nature comprehend not only the attributes and the objects possessing those attributes but also their mutual relationship. The author urges that since the class-concept of *dhūma,* namely, *dhūmatva* is associated with every particular instance (*eg.* smoke) the experience of any *vyāpti* between smoke and fire would mean the cognition of the *vyāpti* between the class-concept of smoke and the class-concept of fire. As already noted in fragment (4) above, the relationship between a particular instance of smoke and its genus is *saṁyukta-āśrita* (dependence on that which is conjoined with the sense-organ). A third kind of *sannikarṣa* (conjunction) was not dealt with in the section dealing with *sannikarṣa* because its subject is also brought out in this same context, says Parāśara. This third kind of *sannikarṣa,* we understand from Vedanta Deśika's remarks is *samyukta-āśrita-āśraya* (being based upon that which is dependent on that which is in conjunction with the sense-organ).

The next fragment (7) is a long one and it discusses the nature and scope of *upādhi* (adventitious condition) which vitiates the invariable concomitance which is vital for a valid inferential cognition. This fragment also points out that all doubts and cases of unwarranted situations can be successfully warded off by *tarka* (indirect argument) itself.

Upādhi is that which restricts or delimits the scope of the relationship between a means and its ends. The contact with wet fuel is the *upādhi* when one tries to prove the existence of smoke by means of fire. Another example is when we try to prove that a particular space forms the faculty of hearing by reason of its being ether. Here *karṇaśaṣkulī* (the external form of the ear) is the *upādhi.* The usual definition of *upādhi* is:

sādhyavyāpakatve sati sādhanāvyāpakatvam

An adventious condition is that which is invariably pervasive of the probandum (sādhya) and non-pervasive of the *probans* (*sādhana*). In this second illustration we find that wherever there is organ of hearing there is the ear (*karṇaśaṣkulī*), whereas there is no such concomitance between ether and the *karṇaśaṣkulī.* Another illustration for *upādhi* is also given: *vimataḥ jīvaḥ saṁsārī, jīvatvāt* (the individual soul in question is liable to transmigration because it is an individual soul). Here *karma, avidyā,* etc., of the soul form the *upādhi.* While they are pervasive of *saṁsāritva,* they are not so with *jīvatva.* Udayana's view that *upādhi* while not being pervasive of the *sādhana* (*sādhana-avyāpaka*), is co-extensive with *sādhya* (*sādhyasamavyāpti*) is also referred to by Parāśara in this passage.

What is the criterion of this *upādhi?* Parāśara replies that it is two-fold: (1) Sometimes the *sādhana* is not related to its *sādhya;* and (2) at the time of cognizing this relation (*vyāpti*) one does not have a cogent and uniform apprehension of the *sādhana.* In other words, there is non-conformity or "straying of the reason" (*vyabhicāra*) which undermines the concept of invariable relationship between the *hetu* and *sādhya.* Another example for *upādhi* is also given by Parāśara: *agnīṣomīyahiṁsā adharmajanikā, hiṁsātvāt.* "Injury to animals which forms part of the *agnīṣomīya*-sacrifice produces sin; because it is injury, like the injury done outside the sacrifice." Here *niṣiddhatva* (being forbidden) forms the *upādhi.* Another example is also given: *ātmā anityaḥ, prameyatvāt.* "Soul is non-eternal, because it is knowable." Here *kṛtakatva* (being produced) is the *upādhi.* The reason which is co-pervasive with the probandum is noticed in the positive illustrations (*sapakṣa*) and it is not present in the subject (*pakṣa*). In such

a form, one fails to recognise its "being pervaded" which gives rise to *upādhi.* An instance is when we try to infer the dark complexion of a child to be born of a woman Maitrī, by the reason that he would be the son of Maitrī (since the other children of that lady are also dark). Here the *upādhi* is *śākādyāhārapariṇāma* (having been born as a result of digesting green vegetable).

Finally Parāśara draws the line between reasons which have *upādhi*-s caused by the incomplete character of their form (*rūpavaikalya*) and between those reasons which have *upādhi*-s caused by the straying (*vyabhicāra*) of those reasons. In the first instance such reasons are called *aprayojaka*-s ('ineffective') whereas in the second we have the usual classification as *bādhita, viruddha, anaikāntika,* etc.

Summing up the discussion, Parāśara notes that *vyabhicāra* consists in the absence of invariable concomitance (*pratibandha*). *Upādhi* alone is the source of such straying of the reason. If the *upādhi* is present in the *sādhana* (probans) and if it is not present in the *sādhya* (probandum) we have an instance of *niścitopādhi* (the determined). If the *upādhi* is not determined on the strength of some other means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) we have what is knwon as *śaṅkitopādhi* ('the doubted').

Fragment (8) discusses the three kinds of *anumāna* which are well known in the Nyāya system as *anvayavyatirekin, kevalānvayin* and *kevalavyatirekin.* Vedānta Deśika who refers to Yāmuna[128] is of the view that the *kevalavyatirekī* type of *anumāna* cannot be considered as an *anumāna* at all. However Parāśara and Varadaviṣṇumiśra whom Vedānta Deśika quotes, seem to accept this three-fold classification. But Vedānta Deśika tries to remove the apparent contradiction by saying that those statements of the two *ācārya*-s must be understood

as presenting the *pūrvapakṣa* view or the view of a section of philosophers.

It appears from this quotation that the *kevalavyatirekin* can be two-fold - the 'determined' (*adhyavasita*), and the undetermined (*anadhyavasita).* Of these the first kind constitutes a good reason (*saddhetu*) which can prove the probandum. The second variety, that is, *anadhyavasita* type is of an unusual kind (*asādhāraṇa*) being present only in the *pakṣa* and absent from both the *sapakṣa* (positive instance) and *vipakṣa* (negative instance), which cannot conclusively prove the probandum. Hence it may be called the semblance of a reason (*ābhāsa*).[129]

The next fragment (9) defines *lakṣaṇa.* According to this, *lakṣaṇa* is that which is the cause of comprehending the form of an entity which is unique to itself. In this process all objects of the similar and dissimilar kinds are also precluded from the scope.

Jāti (genus) and configuration (*ākāra*) for instance, assist a *pramāṇa* (valid means of knowledge) in marking out an individual (such as cow, etc.) from species of a similar kind and a dissimilar kind. This constitutes the *lakṣaṇa* in so far.that particular individual is concerned.

Fragment (10) refutes the *kevalavyatirekin* as a type of inference. When the Naiyāyika tries to prove the "difference from other elements" (*itarabheda*) in the case of earth by reason of its possession of smell (*gandhavatva*), Parāśara asks if earth is already known to exist through a valid means or not. If it is not known, then the defect called *āśraya-asiddhi* ("non-establishment in respect of the locus") accrues. If it is already known to exist then the fallacy of *siddha-sādhana* ('proving the already proved') crops up. It has therefore to be stated by the *pūrvapakṣin* that although the earth is known to exist

in a general form, its special features are not known. Even then, says Parāśara, the *pakṣa* (subject) becomes one whose attribute is not well-known (*aprasiddhaviśeṣaṇa*). Therefore proving the "difference from other entities" (*itaravyavaccheda*) becomes a futile exercise. Further, if a particular means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) stands in need of another *pramāṇa* to substantiate its position, it will result in *anavasthā* (*infinite regress*) and the doctrine of intrinsic validity (*svataḥprāmāṇya*) becomes negated. Therefore, an attribute (e.g. *gandha*) which distinguishes its substantive (the earth) from others itself becomes a definition thereof.

The next fragment (11) is regarding the classification of *anumāna* as *svārtha* ('for one's own self') and *parārtha* ('for the sake of others'). The Viśiṣṭādvaitins as represented by Vedānta Deśika do not accept this classification made by the Naiyāyika-s. According to them all inferences proceed on the basis of one's own understanding and are helpful for one's own verbal usage and actvitiy. There is no element of *parārtha* in them. But it so happens that sometimes we hear a person making a statement regarding the existence of some object (*artha*). Vedānta Deśika feels that even in such a case one understands the meaning of the sentence not because another person has uttered it but because of the *vyāpti* (invariable concomitance) contained in such a sentence. If "being produced by the sentence uttered by another person" forms the criterion of *parārthānumāna*, then some instances of ocular perception (*pratyakṣa*) and verbal testimony (*āgama*) which are sometimes conveyed through a sentence uttered by another person will also turn out to be *parārthānumāna*. Therefore, the division of *pramāṇa*-s must be made on a different basis: *pramāṇa*-s which are self-valid (*svayaṁsiddha*) and *pramāṇa*-s which are conveyed through the medium of setences uttered

by others. Vedānta Deśika quotes the *Tattvaratnākara* in support of this. According to Parāśara all *pramāṇa*-s become valid by the totality of their own causes (*sāmagrī*) which functions on its own (*svataḥ*). Alternately this totality of causes (*sāmagrī*) may present itself through the medium of a sentence uttered by another person. This is the real basis for the two-fold classification of an inference.

The following quotation (12) concerns itself with the members of a syllogism. According to *Nyāya* there are five members in an *anūmāna-vākya* meant to enlighten another person (*parārtha*). They are: *pratijñā* (declaration), *hetu* (reason), *udāharaṇa* (example), *upanaya* (application) and *nigamana* (conclusion). But the *siddhānta* of the Viśiṣṭādvaitins is that there should be no hard and fast rule (*aniyama*) regarding their exact number. Vedānta Deśika quotes the *Tattvaratnākara* which apparently refers to the five members and states thus: "Ultimately, however, Parāśara also expresses the view that no restriction regarding the number should be laid." The *Tattvaratnākara* quotes a line from the *Mahābhārata* (*Sabhāparvan* (Ch.5. Śl. 8a)) *pañcāvayavayuktasya vākyasya guṇadoṣavit* and says that Vedavyāsa and others accept the five-membered syllogism. But later on Parāśara himself declares that if a speaker is able to drive home a particular point to a listener using the minimum number of members, it should still be accepted as an authority since the purpose is served thereby. Moreover according to Parāśara it is not necessary that *pratijñā, hetu* and *udāharaṇa* should appear in that order itself. The point is that *vyāpti* must be clearly comprehended. All other considerations are secondary. Thus if a reliable person (*āpta*) tells someone *dhūmavān agnimāneva* (that which has smoke certainly possesses fire), there is no need at all for the *dṛṣṭānta.*

The subsequent passage (13) does not really constitute a quotation from the *Tattvaratnākara.* It is a recapitulation by Vedānta Deśika of a certain discussion found in the *Tattvaratnākara.* According to Parāśara, *Chala* (dialectic quibbling) and *Jāti* (unavailing objection) do not really contribute to the exclusive victory of a debator whoever his rival may be. They may however help one to make the rival "unarmed" and thus lead to one's success. They may also help to safeguard the truth of some point (*tattva*).

The next fragment (14) points out that strictly speaking *Jāti*-s (unavailing objections) are innumerable. Still in the *Nyāyaśāstra* they are enumerated as twentyfour in number. This is just for the purpose of demonstration (*pradarśana*) and is no final verdict on their number. In fact the *Nyāyasūtra* - *anyadanyasmāt...* etc. (2.2.32) points to this fact.

Fragment (15) discusses the *hetvābhāsa*-s (fallacious reasons). While the *Nyāyasūtra,* I.2.45 mentions *savyabhicāra, viruddha, prakaraṇasama, sādhyasama* and *atītakāla* as the five *hetavābhāsa*-s, those listed in the *Tattvaratnākara,* namely *siddhi, aprasiddhi, bādhyatva, viruddhatva* and *aphalatva seem to be entirely different from them. Vedānta Deśika tries to answer this apparent contradiction in his Nyāyapariśuddhi.* According to Parāśara an inference becomes fallacious (*ābhāsa*) when some of the *aṅga*-s pertaining to its *pakṣa* (subject), *hetu* (reason) and *dṛṣṭānta* (example) fall short of the required number necessary to make an inference full-fledged. When the *pakṣa* falls short of its *aṅga*-s we have the five *ābhāsa*-s of *pratijñā,* such as *siddhi aprasiddhi,* etc., mentioned above. To be clear, if the probandum is already proved, we have *siddha-sādhyatā.* If it is not known already, the fallacy of *aprasiddha-sādhyatā* arises. If it is stultified we have

bādhita-sādhyatā. If there is contradiction we have *viruddha* as a defect. If the *sādhya* is not desired or intended we have *aphalatva.*

In what may be called a Doxography we find Vedānta Deśika mentioning that the *Tattvaratnākara* enters into a very detailed discussion and subdivision of the features such as *aprasiddhi, bādhyatva, viruddhatva,* etc. Reverting again to the *Tattvaratnākara* quotation we find that it mentions some general defects of the *sādhana* (*hetu*) such as *avācaka* ('that which is unworthy of statement') *sandigdha* ('that which is doubted') and *aślīla* ('that which is vulgar). All these are excluded in a definition (*lakṣaṇa*) by the word *pakṣadharma* itself (subject - adjunctness). So all these are fallacies of *pratijñā.* Parāśara also makes a ten-fold classification of the reason from the view-point of fallacies. They are *asiddha, anadhyavasita, viruddha, viśeṣaṇaviruddha, anaikāntika, aprayojaka, bādhya, viruddha-s avyabhicārin, prakaraṇasama* and *siddhasādhana.* He makes a further classification of a *siddha* into nine varieties.

Summing up the above discussion Parāśara points out that deficiency in the number of *avayava* constituting the definition is what is responsible for the fallacious character of *anumāna.* To be more precise, the fallacy of an inference consists in the absence or deficiency of *vyāpyatva* ('being pervaded') or *pakṣadharma* ('subject-adjunctness').

The 16th fragment refers to the general view that all valid means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) are at the mercy (*anugrāhya*) of *tarka* ('indirect argument or *reductio ad absurdum*). This, however, is not acceptable to Parāśara, because the above claim that the validity of all *anumāna* will have to be decided by *tarka* alone leads to *anavasthā* (*infinite regress*). As a matter of fact all cognitions do not require *tarka* at all to gain their validity. *Tarka*

just helps to ward off any doubt that may arise out of a contradiction (*virodha*) or a non-cognition (*abodha*). By itself it doesn't confer validity on any inference.

The next quotation (17) is perhaps the longest one we have from the *Tattvaratnākara.* It tries to prove that *arthāpatti* (presumption) can be included in inference (*anumāna*) itself. It also tries to show the relative position of *tarka* by quoting several views which show its independent character. But the final opinion expressed by Parāśara is that *tarka* cannot be a separate means of knowledge like *anumāna.*

Arthāpatti (presumption) is only a type of inference. The sentence - *śatavarṣajīvī devadattaḥ gṛhe nāsti* ('Devadatta who has a life-span of hundred years is not in his house') shows that *pratyakṣa* (perception) reveals the absence of Devadatta from his house. But there is another *pramāṇa* (the *Jyotiṣaśāstra*) implied in the expression *śatavarṣajīvī* which becomes *niravakāśa* ('without any scope for application'). *Pratyakṣa* is the *sāvakāśa-pramāṇa* ('with a wide scope') here. According to the interpretative rule *niravakāśā vidhayaḥ sāvakāśān vidhīn bādhante* ('rules which have no scope at all for their application stultify those rules which have scope for application') the knowledge that Devadatta lives for hundred years makes us infer that he must be alive somewhere. This principle, when applied to the Vedic rites is known as *sāmānya-viśeṣa nyāya* ('the rule of the general and special'). In the sentence *pīno devadattaḥ divā na bhuṅkte* ('the plumpy Devadatta does not eat during daytime'), the implication is that he eats at night. Here we supply the words necessary to make the sense significant and complete. If the stress is on his *not* eating the food during daytime this sentence becomes an instance of *śrutārthāpatti* ('presumption from what is heard').[130]

When a particular means of knowledge does not have its object 'fully' and clearly established it cannot be treated as independent at least in so far as the "partially unknown" portion is concerned. It is then that the question of incompatibility arises which works as the *liṅga.* Then the argument takes the form of *tarka* ('indirect reasoning') and becomes an accessory of *anumāna* itself.

Tarka cannot independently prove the existence of mind but still it can become a substantiating factor to the *āgama* texts which declare the existence of mind (even in the case of Īśvara). Parāśara then quotes passages like *manasaitān kāmān paśyan ramate, mano' sya divyam cakṣuḥ*[131] and *etasmāt jāyate prāṇaḥ manaḥ sarvendriyāṇi ca*[132] in support of this view.

Vedānta Deśika then quotes some passages from the *Tattvaratnākara* which seem to state that *tarka* is not a separate *pramāṇa* in one place and that it is an independent *pramāṇa* in another place. Ultimately however, this contradiction is resolved by saying that *tarka* was mentioned as a separate *pramāṇa* in a few places only by virtue of its having a separate purpose and a separate form. This, therefore, does not prove the independent character of *tarka.*

The following fragment (18) speaks of the denotative power of words. The mutual connection between a word (*śabda*) and its meaning (*artha*) is called *abhidhā* and this is two-fold as primary (*mukhya*) and secondary (*jaghanya*). When a person uses a word, the meaning which is conveyed purely by its denotative power is called "primary". If through this primary meaning we arrive at another meaning it is "secondary".

The subsequent quotation (19) concerns itself with an important concept of the real import of words in a sentence and their mutual connection. According to

the Prābhākara-s the words in a sentence themselves have no meaning but they obtain it only through a syntactical combination (*anvitābhidhāna*) (theory of signification in syntactical combination). The Bhāṭṭa-s, however, admit that words possess a meaning independently of such a combination and hence this theory is known as *abhihitānvaya* ('the theory of the combination of significant terms'). In the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, the ācārya-s like Yāmuna, Parāśara and Vedānta Deśika accept the *Anvitābhidhāna*-theory. Vedānta Deśika quotes several passages from Rāmānuja's works which seem to support the *Abhihitānvaya*-theory and ultimately reconciles them with the prevailing view.[133] The two verses of the *Tattvaratnākara* quoted here are in full support of the *Anvitābhidhāna*-theory. In one of these Parāśara refers to Yāmunācārya himself as an advocate of this view.[134] Parāśara further points that the theory of *abhihitānvaya* is riddled with the problem of *viparyaya* (contradiction).

The next fragment (20) is in the form of a verse in the *Mālinī* metre beginning with *Upaniṣadi tu...* which is prefaced by Vedānta Deśika thus: *"āhuścaivam abhiyuktāḥ".* Then he quotes a few lines from Parāśara's *Śrīraṅgarājastava* (2.14) and then says *anyatra ca.* He has not specifically stated that the verse *'upaniṣadi tu...'* etc., is from the *Tattvaratnākara.* The verse in question runs thus: "In all the *Upaniṣad*-s, Lord Viṣṇu who is an abode of innumerable perfections devoid of all defects, is declared as the Supreme Being. The *Pāñcarātra* texts are His own compositions (*upajña*). Even the Veda therefore cannot become an alternative to these texts. This has clearly been stated by Yāmuna and Rāmānuja."[135]

The fragment (21) that follows states that Mīmāṁsā as a *śāstra* deals with *karma* (action), *devatā* (deities) and *Brahman* (the Supreme Being) and that Jaimini,

Kāśakṛtsna and Bādarāyaṇa composed Sūtra-s on these three topics respectively.[136] Rāmānuja, and following him Vedānta Deśika maintain that the entire Mīmāṁsā, that is, the *Pūrva* and the *Uttara* portion put together form a single *śāstra* (*aika-śāstrya*).[137]

The next fragment (22) enumerates the topics that are dealt with in the *Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtra*-s of Jaimini. They are (1) *Dharmadhī* (Veda-s as the authority on *dharma*), (2) *Mānabheda* (mutual difference among the rites), (3) *Aṅga* (the relationship between the principal and subsidiary rites), (4) *Prayukti* (the relation between the *prayojya* and *prayojaka*-rites), (5) *Krama* (the sequence to be followed in performing certain rites), (6) *Kartṛ* (same as *adhikāra*) (those who are qualified to perform these rites), (7) *Atideśa* (application or supplying the *aṅga*-s of one rite to other rites), (8) *Viśeṣa* (a special treatment of the *atideśa*-s mentioned above), (9) *Ūha* (altering certain passages in accordance with the context), (10) *Bādha* (the problem of stultification or contradiction among the rites), (11) *Tantra* (a contrivance or means which leads to two or more results) and (12) *Prasakti* (same as *prasaṅga,* contingency).

The subsequent quotation (23) points out the status of *smṛti* (recollection). Since *smṛti* depends upon an object that has already been experienced, whatever definition applies to *anubhava* will also apply to *smṛti.* So there is no fear of over-pervasion (*ativyāpti*) of the definition of *anubhava* to cases of *smṛti.* In fact without ascertaining the scope of a definition in terms of its *lakṣya* (object) and *alakṣya* (that which is other than its object) how can one ever find fault with it? All mental activities in our day-to-day life have a precise demarcation of what is to be realised and what is not to be realised by such an activity, says Parāśara.

Fragment (24) discusses the role of *ceṣṭita* (*ceṣṭā*) (gesticulation as a means of communication of ideas). Parāśara points out that if a *ceṣṭā* (gesture) is confined to imparting instruction or conveying an idea to one person by another person, it may be treated as *śābda* (verbal in character). Even in cases where there is no such restriction of gesticulation, it can still convey an idea with the help of glances. As such it need not be taken as a separate means of knowledge. Vedānta Deśika opines that *ceṣṭā* can be traced to *anumāna* itself.[138]

The role of *Pratibhā* (revelation) is also discussed by Parāśara. Some argue that it can be accepted as a separate means of knowledge since it can cognise things without any reference to external objects. This *pratibhā* arises in some special persons through a remarkable degree of concentration and it can reveal things of past, present and future. In reply Parāśara states that though all this is true it is still difficult for us to identify the different periods of time (*kālabheda*) which become the objects of such a revelation. The actual *phala* (result or utility) of *pratibhā* will come into picture only when its validity is ascertained. But since the sense of validity arises from other means, critics (*parīkṣakāḥ*) normally do not consider *pratibhā* as a separate *pramāṇa*. Moreover this *pratibhā* leads to realisalion of truth only in the case of highly pious persons. Patañjai[139] uses the word *Pratibhā* only with reference to such an extra-ordinary yogic vision. So it does not pertain to the normal realm of validity.

The next fragment (25) speaks of the sense-organs as six in number including mind (*manas*) which is the inner organ.

Fragment 26 names the sense-organs which are the seats or the substrate of qualities. These are: ears, body

(skin), eyes, tongue and nose (with reference to *śabda* (sound), *sparśa* (touch), *rūpa* (colour), *rasa* (taste) and *gandha* (smell). Vedanta Deśika observes that this statement of Parāśara represents the popular view, since according to the *Nyāyatattva* of Nāthamuni serpents can hear through their eyes alone.[140]

The following fragment (27) points out that when a flame of lamp is burning continuously one can notice, on a very minute observation that there is in fact a very subtle difference between one flame and another flame on one and the same wick.

The discussion as understood from the *Nyāyasiddhāñjana* is concerning the momentariness (*kṣaṇikatva*) of a flame burning on a wick. The flame that is produced by one molecule of oil and a bit of the wick differs from the flame produced by another molecule of oil and a bit of the wick, still one does not cognise the difference between them because of their identical forms. Even if one tries to recognise them as one (*pratyabhijñā*) it is fallacious, being based on *bhrama*. The *Tattvaratnākara* says that even in such a case, on a close observation one can still notice a flame ending up and giving rise to a fresh flame. This is similar to the observation of subtle streams of water distinguishable in a river and the like.

Fragment 28 begins with a reference to *tamas* which is said to bind the beings when they prove unfaithful to Hari, and which is said to release them when they surrender to Him. So an investigation into its nature is quite relevant. The knowledge that *tamas* binds persons will lead to a subsequent effort to get released from it. Many wise men entertain different views regarding the nature, origination and the means of knowing *tamas*.

The word *tamas* here means *Prakṛti* (primordial matter). On the authority of Vedānta Deśika we understand that there is a break in the *Tattvaratnākara*-text at this point. The subsequent portion *atra ālokābhāvaḥ...,* etc., discusses actually *andhakāra* (darkness) which is also known as *tamas.* According to the Vaiśeṣika-s darkness is the 'absence of light'. According to the Prābhākara-s it is the simple recollection (*smaraṇa*) of a blue (dark) colour. The Bhāṭṭa-s think of it to be a different substance whereas those who know the truth declare it to be *pradhāna* itself. In the verse that follows Parāśara notes that *tamas* is same as *māyā,* the divine power of the Lord, which possesses three qualities and which exists in the gross and subtle forms. It is said to be both external and internal.

Vedānta Deśika observes that from these fragments we can conclude that Parāśara discussed the nature of *Prakṛti* (primordial matter) alone but not *andhakāra* (darkness) although a reference has been made to it by quoting the view of Vaiśeṣika-s and others.

The next fragment (29) is another long passage which establishes the self-luminosity (*svayamprakāśatva*) of knowledge. In the first three verses Parāśara sums up the reasons supporting this view and what follows it is an explanation of this idea. Knowledge of an object is directly acquired but not inferred through features like 'manifestedness' (*prākaṭya*). Nor can it be known through *'mānasapratyakṣa'* (mental cognition). Since no other means can prove the existence of *jñāna* other than itself, it has to be admitted as self-luminous. Once knowledge arises we have the subsequent cognition "I know this". In between the state of cognition and the subsequent verbal usage there is neither an inference nor mental cognition, for then the process of knowing would be delayed. Further, once the knowledge arises there is no

verbal statement as 'I do not know'. That means when knowledge arises, it immediately shines forth to the self of the person concerned. Further, in stream-cognitions (*dhārāvāhika-jñāna*) only one object is perceived continuously. No second knowledge arises in the middle. If such a feature is accepted, there will not be stream-cognition at all. This also proves knowledge to be self-manifest. If the stream-cognition is not admitted to be self-luminous it is imperative that it gets destroyed. Then there will not be any subsequent recollection. Further, according to Parāśara, the *anvaya-vyatirekin* type of inference, *arthāpatti* (presumption), *yukti* (supporting argument) and *vacana* (scriptures) prove *jñāna* to be self-luminous.

The prose passage that follows, according to Vedānta Deśika is Parāśara's own explanation of what he stated briefly in verse-form: "The knowledge under discussion does not stand in need of anything that belongs to the same kind (*sajātīya*) as itself, for purposes of cognizing the objects that fall within its range. The examples given are *artha* (an object), *indriya* (sense-organ) and *dīpa* (lamp). These things have their own role to play in producing the knowledge of say, a pot. The pot, for its cognition, does not stand in need of another pot. It requires a *vijātīya* (dissimilar) entity, namely an eye, for that purpose. The eye again does not require another eye which is *sajātiya* (homogeneous) with it but requires a lamp. The lamp does not require another lamp because it is self-luminous.[141] Likewise knowledge does not require another knowledge for its manifestation because it is self-luminous. The eye no doubt depends on the light, which according to the Naiyāyika-s is of the same stuff as the eye, being *taijasa* in nature. But according to the Viśiṣṭādvaitin-s the eye is an *indriya* produced from *ahaṁkāra* and hence it is dissimilar to light. Therefore,

An inferential statement may be made here: "The latent impressions (*saṁskāra*-s) which are responsible for the recollection of knowledge do not require the experience (*anubhava*) of the *jñāna* which is produced in a self because they are *saṁskāra*-s like any other *saṁskāra*." This needs a clarification. All the *saṁskāra*-s do not require the experience of the knowledge which pertains to a soul. Thus when we remember a pot, the *ghaṭa-saṁskāra* just needs the experience of the *viṣaya* (pot) only as seen by a person. It does not require the experience of the *jñāna* itself pertaining to that object. In other words *jñāna* by itself produces *saṁskāra*-s regarding certain objects and these *saṁskāra*-s in their turn just require the experience of the object only but not of the knowledge itself. Thus it can be proved that knowledge is *svayamprakāśa* (self-luminous) and *svānubhavarūpa* (of the form of the experience concerning its object). In other words, we do not say, "I have the *saṁskāra* of *ghaṭa-jñāna* and hence I remember *ghaṭa*". We simply remember the *ghaṭa*.

Another inference is also made by Parāśara: "The impressions concerning an object (*viṣaya-saṁskāra*) arise simultaneously along with the impressions of knowledge (*jñāna-saṁskāra*) since the former are the impressions pertaining to an object. The *saṁskāra* of the object produced here and the *saṁskāra* regarding the knowledge of that object both come into being at one and the same time. This means that knowledge when it grasps an object produces a *saṁskāra* of that object also. In addition it produces a *saṁskāra* regarding its own essential nature. All this goes to prove that knowledge is self-existent and self-luminous.

A *prima facie* view is also given here: "*Saṁskāra*-s concerning an object (*viṣaya*) and knowledge (*jñāna*) can

be said to arise at one and the same time only when the knowledge that arises concerns both *viṣaya* and *jñāna.* Even the critic who claims knowledge to be self-manifest must accept that knowledge pertains to a *viṣaya* such as a pot only, but not to *jñāna* itself. That being the case how can two kinds of *saṃskāra* (*jñāna-saṁskāra* and *viṣayasaṁskāra*) arise simultaneously"? This is answered by Parāśara in the following manner: 'It is simple to accept that knowledge, as it rises, produces both *viṣayasaṁskāra* and *jñānasaṁskāra.* It is cumbersome to state that these *saṁskāra*-s are produced by knowledge which has both these *saṁskāra*-s as its object'.

Knowledge cannot be manifested by any other means other than by itself, for it will then become similar to pot and other objects. Parāśara quotes scriptural passages like *atrāyam puruṣah svayamjyotir bhavati,*[142] *atmaivāsya jyotiḥ*[143] and *svena jyotiṣā āste.*[144] These point to the self-luminous character of the self, which is synonymous with the term *jñāna.* The *Gītā* verse *yathā prakāśayatyekaḥ* (13-33) is quoted to show that even as the Sun and his effulgence are self-luminous, the soul and its knowledge are also self-manifest.

In the next fragment (30) Parāśara refutes the view of the Bhāṭṭa-s that knowledge is realised through *mānasa pratyakṣa*. If it is so, we should have a cognition of the *mānasa pratyakṣa* itself and there is nothing standing in our way of cognising the *mānasa pratyakṣa.* But it is not so. On the strength of the non-apprehension of this mental cognition we can conclude that *mānasa pratyakṣa* does not cognise knowledge. Since knowledge is self-manifest there is no need for *mānasa pratyaksa* itself. If *mānasa pratyakṣa* is still posited, there will be

the defect of *anavasthā.* Further the Naiyāyika-s advance two reasons in support of the theory of *mānasa pratyakṣa.* (1) That knowledge is a special attribute of the self while being momentary *(kṣaṇika)* and (2) Being a special attribute of the self, it is fit to be experienced *(yogya).* But these two reasons are vitiated by the fallacies of *asiddhi* and *vyabhicāra* (for the Viśiṣṭādvaitins *jñāna* is not momentary). It cannot be grasped by mind also. Therefore the desired qualities of *kṣaṇikatva* (momentariness) and *yogyatva* (fitness) being absent in *jñāna,* there is the defect of *asiddhi.* The defect of *vyabhicāra* also accrues from the viewpoint of the merit *(dharma)* arising out of expiatory rites *(prāyaścitta).* When one performs the *prāyaścitta* rite the merit that is produced destroys the sin of that person and in the very next moment it gets dissolved. So this *dharma* arising out of *prāyaścitta* is also momentary and is special attribute to the self. Since this is not cognized by *mānasapratyakṣa* there is the defect of *vyabhicāra.* Therefore, the two reasons cannot prove the desired end. Thus due to the absence of a favourable proof and due to the presence of the stultifying proof, knowledge can never be the object of mental perception. Therefore, it is *svatassiddha* (self-existent that is, self-luminous). Parāśara also remarks that this is the method adopted in the *Saṁvitsiddhi* (of Yāmuna).

Fragment 31 comprises a single sentence. It is in refutation of the Advaitic theory that *pratyakṣa* cognises the "bare existence" or "being" (*sanmātra*) of an entity. Parāśara states that in the transmigratory state the knowledge of an individual is no doubt contracted; still it is to be accepted that his knowledge will be lasting as long as the sense-organ is in contact with an object.

The next fragment (32) points out that the grammarians have their own sphere of activity clearly marked out for them. They should explain the formation of words with the help of the stem (*prakṛti*), the suffix (*pratyaya*) and intonation (*svara*) according to the usages found in literature. The idea is that they need not enter into discussions of philosophical character.[145]

Fragment 33 is quoted by Vedānta Deśika in support of the view that *śabda* (sound) is the characteristic feature of *gagana* (ether). The expression *"gagana-guṇa-śabda"* is what is relevant in this context.

The subsequent quotation (34), we understand, from the *Nyāyasiddhāñjana,* is from the view-point of the Vaiśeṣika school but not from that of the *siddhānta.* A streak of fire when it consumes, say fuel, cannot itself produce a subsequent form of the object. When a streak of fire comes into contact with an object the process of *pāka* (cooking or baking) sets in. Here, the contact fire has with one portion of the object is different from the contact fire has with another portion of the object.[146]

The next passage (35) according to Vedānta Deśika, is found in a context where Parāśara proves the atomicity (*aṇutva)* of mind.This passage apparently refutes the contact which subsists between all-pervasive substances (*vibhu)* which is known as *aja-saṁyoga* (literally "contact which is not-yet-born"). Deśika notes that this must be from the viewpoint of the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools because there alone the contact between *vibhu*-substances is denied. According to Viśiṣṭādvaita, *kāla* (Time) is all-pervasive and also an object of perception. Its contact with another all-pervasive entity, namely Īśvara is also accepted. (Only then the concept of Time being the body of Īśvara becomes meaningful). The *Tattvaratnākara*

passage proceeds as follows: "There is nothing inconsistent even if we do not accept the contact between two all-pervasive substances. What is the means of knowledge which cognizes the contact of a pillar, etc., with an all pervasive substance like ether, etc? It cannot be perception because in this conjunction involving two things, we have only one object perceptible. Even inference cannot be the proof of this contact because for it both the objects must be finite. The qualities of *paratva* (remoteness) and *aparatva* (proximity), the movement of the body (involving its contact with the soul), the modifications that take place in the body and the upward burning of fire can all be accounted for only by accepting an *asamavāyikāraṇa* (non-inherent cause) in the form of the "conjunction with soul" (*ātma-saṁyoga*) which itself is associated with *adṛṣṭa* (unseen merit).

Fragment 36 shows that *saṁkhyā* (number) is known only in the second moment of the perception of an object and that it is related with its correlate through *samavāya* (inherence). Vedānta Deśika observes that Viśiṣṭādvaita does not accept *saṁkhyā* as a separate category. Since the section of the *Tattvaratnākara* where the *prameya* is dealt with is lost, it is difficult to say if this view is Parāśara's own or not.

The next fragment (37) states that *bheda* (difference) need not be posited as a separate quality. When *dravya* (substance), *jāti* (generality), *guṇa* (quality) and *karman* (activity) are once recognised as existent, we can, through their specific features (*dharma*), account for knowledge, verbal usage, action, etc. A new quality called *bheda* need not be accepted as subsisting between one object and another. This is why *pṛthaktva* (separateness), *viśeạ* (particularity), etc., accepted by the Vaiśeṣika-s are hereby

refuted. Parāśara then says: "When we see two distinct colours like blue and white we notice that they also distinguish the substances qualified by them. *Dvitva* (two-ness), *pṛthaktva* (separateness) and such other features depend upon the difference of objects; the difference of objects in turn depends upon *dvitva, pṛthaktva,* etc. Thus there is the defect called *ātmāśraya* or *anyonyāśraya.* Those who subscribe to this view (those who follow the Vaiśeṣika theory) must therefore be afraid of such contingency. But we who accept that the perceived blue colour itself constitutes the difference of an object (from others), have no such fear."

Fragment 38 gives some broad definitions of terms like *jāti, guṇa, kriyā* and *dravya.* At the outset the word *artha* (entity) is defined as that which is contacted by senses and which is thus made the object of cognition. These are fourfold: *dravya, jāti, guṇa* and *karman.* It is to be noted here that *karman* is mentioned separately from *guṇa.* Later on we find the following statement: 'If we accept that *sāmānya* (generality) is present in *jāti, guṇa* and *karman,* the relation between them becomes *saṁyuktasamaveta-samavāya.* (The contact between the senses and objects is *saṁyoga:* and the contact between *jāti, guṇa* and *karman* with the objects is *samavāya* and the relation of *sāmānya* with them is *samavāya*). Here again *karman* is spoken of separately. Vedānta Deśika notes that these passages do not prove that the contact with *karman* is something different from *guṇa.* Parāśara first included *sāmānya* (generality) in the configuration (*saṁsthāna*) of the objects. But here he seems to treat it as a separate feature. Likewise *karman* which is earlier shown as part of *saṁyoga* is spoken of here as different from it. The conclusion is that one cannot treat these observations on *karman* and *sāmānya*

The subsequent sentences of this quotation attempt a very broad definition for *jāti, guṇa* etc. "*Jāti* is an internal (*antaraṅga*) feature of a particular substance (which is the *dharmin*). That special, distinct and already existent feature which is brought into being by this *jāti* is called *guṇa*. If such a distinct feature is to be created afresh (*sādhya*) it is called *kriyā*. That which is the substratum of all these that is, *jāti, guṇa* and *kriyā* is known as *dravya* (substance). A very close examination of these definitions will be undertaken in the *prameya*-section." This section, however is lost.

Fragment 39 is a discussion on *sādṛśya* (similarity) and *jāti* (universal). Here again because of the non-availability of the *prameya* section of the *Tattvaratnākara* it is not possible to know the intended idea of Parāśara. According to this school, *sādṛśya* (similarity) is not something different from the *saṁsthāna* or *ākṛti* of the things involved. The passage may be translated as follows: "Many think that *sādṛśya* (similarity between two or more objects) consists in the sameness of a majority of parts constituting those objects. Since this is different topic for discussion it will be dealt with in the section on *prameya*."

In the subsequent portion of this quotation we find the following discussion: "A question may be raised: *dravyatva* (substance-ness), *pṛthivītva* (being a portion of earth), *śuklatva* (whiteness) and *pākatva* (being a *pāka* - cooking or baking) must be accepted as universals (*sāmānya*) of *dravya, pṛthivī, śukla* and *pāka* respectively. If such a generality is not accepted as is done by the Vaiśeṣika-s, how can we account for the usage of the word "one" (*eka*) with reference to objects that have such a generality? Likewise, *santati* (sequcnce), *avasthā* (condition), etc., also cannot be referred to by a single

word if there were no unitary *prayojaka* (criterion). Parāśara replies that this is a question to be answered by the critic also. All the people in the world use the word *sarva* (everything) and think that all the things under the sun can be conveyed by it. Then will the Vaiśeṣika accept *sarvatva* (all-ness) as a generality pertaining to all things? If he is not prepared to accept, then it means that *jāti* (genus) concerning individuals cannot be conveyed through a single word."

In the next verse and the following sentence Parāśara makes this observation: "All objects belonging to the same category can be referred to by a single expression because the objects thus conveyed have a uniform nature or form. Thus when we say 'moon' or 'sun' the meaning conveyed is that there is 'one moon' and 'one sun' but not many. Therefore the *vācyārtha* (the expressed object) becomes one, because it is unitary. When we utter the word *ghaṭa* (pot), and *paṭa* (a piece of cloth) the actual individual pots and piece of cloth are no doubt innumerable but still they all share a common feature namely *ghaṭatva* (potness) and *paṭatva* (clothness) by reason of which they are referred to as a pot and a cloth." This explanation is given for the sake of those who accept *jāti* as a distinct category. But for those who do not accept *jāti* as something different from the configuration of the object itself the following explanation is offered: "In the pots there is a single *upādhi* (limiting adjunct), namely, the configuration (*saṁsthāna*) by which all the individual pots can be referred to by a single word 'pot'. So even if one does not accept *jāti,* at least an *upādhi* in the form of 'configuration' has to be accepted through which all the individual (*vyakti*) can be referred to through a single

unitary reference can be made in as much as these so-called *upādh-is* (or *saṁsthāna-s*) keep changing. The answer is that in those configuration we can notice a 'similarity' (*sādṛśya*) or non-cognition of difference (*bhedāgraha*), on these two grounds, we can still consider those *saṁsthāna*-s as one and all the individuals possessing them can be connoted by a single word."

Fragment 40 also defines *jāti* and *guṇa* (*cf:* fragment 38). When the sense-organ contacts an object, what is cognized first as the very animating principle (as an indispensable feature) of that object is *jāti* (genus). What is cognized subsequently as a distinguishing characteristic in an object thus 'animated' by *jāti* is known as a *guṇa.*

The subsequent quotation is found in the *Seśvaramīmāṁsā* (under Ch.I. section 1) of Vedānta Deśika. According to this Parāśara showed in the section on *śabda* (forming part of *Tattvaratnākara*) that sentences forming part of the Vedic literature gain their validity only on the ground of their impersonal character (*apauruṣeyatva*) although all other *śabda*-s are also valid in general way through *śāstra* like *Mīmāṁsā* and *Nyāya.*

The last fragment (42) is not an actual quotation from the *Tattvaratnākara.* Vedānta Deśika mentions merely the author of *Tattvaratnākara* (*tattvaratnākara kāraiḥ*) in support of his interpretation of the word *vidhi* found in the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā* (1.2.7). According to him the word *vidhi* means *śāsana* (commandment) which is same as inducement (*preṣaṇam*). "This is the real connotation of the word *vidhi* in relation to the *Veda-s.* Others also subscribe to this view. The author of the *Tattvaratnākara* has also stated so," says Vedānta Deśika.

TIRUMAÑJANAKAVI-S

As already mentioned in the second chapter of this book, Parāśara composed stray verses in connection with the *'Tirumajjana'* -sacred ablution - (*Tirumañjana* in Tamil) given to the icon of Lord Raṅganātha. 28 verses are now available in print.[147] These verses have a scholarly and lucid interpretation by Parāśara himself in the *maṇipravāla* style and all of them with his commentary have been published recently.[148] It is quite possible that more verses were composed by Parāsara in the same context. It is even said that some of the descendants of Parāśara still possess those extra verses with them.[149]

The first of these stray verses is in the form of an interesting dialogue between the Lord and man. This verse is read when the icon of the Lord is given the ceremonial bath, that is, when, to use the expression of the poet himself, the Lord appears as a *mṛgyamadhyastha* ('one who is in search of a referee'').

Noticing the impunity and stubbornness of the *jīva* who thinks of himself as independent, the Lord points out that the *jīva*—on the authority of *śruti*-s, *Gītā* and men of wisdom,—always belongs to the Supreme. But the *jīva* enters into a debate with the Lord. The idol of the Lord, wet due to the *abhiṣeka* appears to our poet as though the Lord, to prove His claim on the individual soul, is taking an oath wearing wet clothes and a garland of the basil (Tulasī) leaves. This practice is known as *divya* in the *Smṛti*-texts.[150] So Parāśara feels that in this particular context the Lord appears to be doing *jala-divya* as well as *Tulasī-divya.* The dialogue between the Lord and the *jīva* may be presented as follows:

God (G) : You are mine (you belong to me).

Man (M) : I belong to myself.

G : (No) How is it possible?

M : How about your own claim?

G : This is on the authority of the *Veda-s.*

M : My statement is based on my experience which is beginningless in nature.

G : But this is repudiated.

M : Where and by whom is it repudiated?

G : By me, clearly, in the *Gītā.*

M : Who is the witness?

G : A man of wisdom.

M : Well, then, he is partial to you.

It is a stroke of Parāśara's genius that has presented this beautiful conversation between God and man, of whom the God is ever eager[151] and ready to establish the *śeṣa-śeṣi* relation between Himself and the rest of the creation.

In the second verse the poet fancies the Lord to be a river (*nada*), employing *double entendre.* A river is approached by people for activities (*anuvṛtti*) such as bathing, drinking etc. The Lord also is approached by His devotees in several ways (*anuvṛtti*) such as meditation, loving devotion, worship and service. A river again is resorted to by royal swans, a host of other birds and it shines beautifully with lotuses. The Lord is served by great kings and is magnificent with His *abja* (conch). The river is swept over by fragrant breeze (*sumarudgaṇa*). The Lord is waited upon by many celestials (*sumarudgaṇa*).

In verses 3 and 6 Lord Raṅganātha is identified with a *suradruma* (the celestial desire-yielding tree). Here again Parāśara employs pun. The tree has several broad branches (*śākhā*); it confers the desired boons on those who approach it; it can be resorted to only by the celestials (*tridaśa*). It is beautiful with its leaves (*suparṇa*) and flowers (*sumanas*). It is resorted to by swans and such others birds (*haṁsādisaddvija*). The Lord is also the purport of several Vedic recensions (*śākhā*-s), and He is ready to confer all boons on those who surrender to Him; He is the object of enjoyment for only the *nityasūri*-s (*tridaśa*-s). He is beautiful with His Garuḍa vehicle (*suparṇa*) and is surrounded by the devotees (*sumana*-s). He is served by the twice-born and the greatest saints (*haṁsa*).

In another verse (śl. 4) we find Lord Raṅgarāja identified with an ocean (*jalanidhi*). The ocean is dark green in colour like the *marakata* gems and has its body dazzling with a number of pearls and such other precious stones. It has its own aroma. It is the abode of a variety of aquatic beings, including the giant fish (*mīna*). Lord Raṅgarāja has a number of ornaments made of *marakata* and brilliant pearl-garlands. His body emits wonderful fragrance. He has created a variety of beings and assumed the form of a giant fish (*mīna*).

The Lord is then compared to the *Veda* which is endless (*ananta*), of the nature of nectar (*amṛta*-immortality) and contains everything (*siddhasarvārtha*) in itself. It has positive guidelines regarding the nature of the self. It confers what all one desires by its mere recitation (chanting). Lord Raṅganātha too has these features. He is of the form of immortality and infinity (*amṛta* and *ananta*). He has created the entire universe and has set standards for everything (through the *Śruti*

and *Smṛti*) and controls everything as their innermost self. The real nature of His self is known only to Himself. He blesses all when propitiated through the *kīrtana*-s (verse 6).

In verse 7 the Lord is identified with the beautiful (*śrīmān*) spring season (*vasanta*) which puts forth many a flower in its advent and which adorns the *aśoka* tree, with beautiful buds (*kalikālaṅkṛta*), making it attractive to bees (*brahmara-hita*). It is full of bliss caused by the gentle and pleasant touch of breeze (*pavanaja-mahānanda*). The Lord is also glorious with Śrī (*śrīmān*), rendering even this Kaliyuga a *Kṛtayuga* (*kalikālaṅkṛta*). He is free from misery (*aśoka*) and dispelling all-illusion (*bhrama-rahita*). Lord Raṅganātha is full of the bliss of embracing Hanumān (*pavanaja- mahānanda*).

Lord Raṅgarāja is conceived of as the moon in the next verse. But this is a moon with a difference. The moon normally makes the lilies bloom only at night; he is not full (*pūrṇa*) throughout; he cannot be seen in the daytime. He is full of defects and difficulties (*upaplava*). But this moon, namely, Lord Raṅganātha makes the *Kumuda* (the earth) bloom always (*aniśam*). He is always full (*pūrṇa*) and can be seen both day and night and is free from all defects (verse 8).

During the constellation of *śrāvaṇa* which is very auspicious for *Viṣṇu,* Lord *Raṅganātha* is given a sacred bath in the early morning, being accompanied by many a twice-born (*sārdham-dvijaiḥ*). This according to the poet, indicates that the Lord is putting into practice what He Himself has commanded others to do through the *śruti* and *smṛti*-texts (śl. 9).

In another metaphor Lord Raṅgarāja is identified with

a swan, who has a beautiful flapping up of the wings (*pakṣapāta*); it resorts to waters (*bhuvana*) and abides in the *mānasa*-lake (during the rainy season); it also stays in lotuses. The Lord for His part, is 'partial' to the virtuous (*satpakṣapāta*); He is the supporter of the universe (*bhuvana*) and is the abode of *Padmā* (His consort). He always abides in the hearts of the virtuous (*sanmānasa*) (śl. 10).

In another poetic fancy (śl. 11) the poet describes the garland of lotuses adorning the broad chest of the Lord as a series of brilliant rays emanating from the gem-studded anklets of the lotus-feet of Lakṣmī who moves about freely thereon.

The Lord is again compared to an ocean having many a precious gem (*maṇivara-ruci-vāhī*), the fish inside and also the white conch. The ocean never transgresses the limit (*velā*) and contains all the waters in himself (*bhuvanabhāra*). Lord Raṅganātha is bedecked by a number of jewels and He too has the *matsya* (as his form in the *Matsya*-incarnation). He bears the white conch, supports the universe (*bhuvanabhāra*) and does not waste time (*velā*) (that is, delay) in saving His devotees (śl. 12).

In verses 13 and 14 the Lord is likened to the celestial mountain (Mount Meru). The mountain by its vast slopes covers all the directions (*āśāpūrti*). It is famous for its gold (*kalyāṇa*). It has drunk as it were, the brilliance of the sky (*pīta-ambara*). It brings joy to all the gods by providing lofty and secure residences for them (*svāsthya-utsedha*). It is also the place for several animals to live (*sattvanivāsa*). Lord Raṅganātha fulfils the desires (*āśāpūrti*) of all by His manifold gestures of magnanimity. He brings in the welfare (*kalyāṇa*) for all and is fond

of yellow silk (*pītāmbara*). Because of His great concern for the well-being of the people (*svāsthyotsedha*). He is a source of great delight for the virtuous; He is the repository of the quality of *sattva* (serenity).

At the time of ablutions the Lord is also like a confluence of several sacred rivers (*sarvatīrtha*). In saving His dependants He is quite fast (*Vegavatī*). The marks of saffron on His chest make Him *tāmra* (copper-red) (that is, the river *Tāmraparnī*), His shoulders are lofty, beautiful and strong which make him *Tuṅgabhadrā.* His speech is gentle and affectionate which name Him a 'Narmadā' and His beautiful lower lip is red in colour (Śoṇa) which makes Him the river *Śoṇā* (śl. 15).

The Lord in the *sanctum sanctorum* is also compared to the Sun dispelling the darkness within. He is red in complexion due to the heavy applications of saffron and is beautiful in the company of Lakṣmī. He has the soft red lotus as the seat. The Sun rises in all glory (*udañcitaśrīḥ*) and is heralded by the red-hued charioteer Aruṇa and stays in gentle red lotus (śl. 16).

In the next verse (śl. 17) the presiding deity of Śrīraṅgam is figuratively spoken of as a cloud. The cloud is known for its lightning, deep rumbles and dark blue colour. It is the remover of heat, being laden with water and it gladdens *Cātaka* birds and the like. The Lord also has the lightning in the form of Lakṣmī and is the source for *nāda* (the principle of sound). His bodily complexion is dark as the *indranīla* gem and He is also the remover of affliction (*santāpa*) of His devotees. He is full with waters of compassion and brings joy to the virtuous.

Verse 18 compares the Lord to the Sun. At the auspicious time of *darśa* (new moon) marked by the

performances of sacrifices, etc., the Lord is given the ablutions. His two consorts Padmā (*Śrī*) and Urvī (*Bhūmi*) are full of joy, and in all directions one can see multitudes of *dvija*-s (twice-born) up and active. The darkness of the world is dispelled by Him. Even when the Sun rises, darkness is dispelled and beds of lotuses (*padma*) become full-blown. All the birds (*dvija*) wake up and fill the directions with their chirping notes.

When the Lord's chest is applied with turmeric powder (*rajanī*) after the *abhiṣeka,* it appears like the complexion of the golden hued consort (Lakṣmī) residing there, that has become visible (śl. 19).

In verse 20, the poet makes what seems to be a non-contextual reference to other schools of thought. He says that the earth has been vitiated by innumerable interpretations (of the scriptures) offered by the non-Vedic schools as also by the so-called orthodox schools with perverted visions. As ill-luck would have it, the world is being consumed by the conflagration of the innumerable, endless and unpardonable offences (*aparādha*) committed against the Lord Himself. It is under such circumstances that the Śrīvaiṣṇava system advocated by Sage Lakṣmaṇa (Śrī Rāmānuja) set in as the rainy season dedicated to remove the terrible (spiritual) drought seizing the earth. The Lord's grace has started raining copiously, inundating this benign earth.

Verse 21 identifies Lord Raṅgānātha with a bee. Both of them stay in *sumanas* (in the hearts of good people and flowers); they are both dark in colour like the *indranīla* gem and are pleasing to the eye; they both are popular and all-pervasive (*prathita-pracāra*) among the *śākhā*-s (the Vedic recensions and the branches of

for His consort (*smaraguṇa*) whereas the bee is set on Manmatha's bow as its string (*smaraguṇa*).

The succeeding verse compares the Lord to the moon. The moon is a souce of *amṛta* (nectar). The moon dispels the darkness of the world by its rays and pleases the people who are in love. He has (sixteen) parts (*sakala*) and is the source of happiness for all. The Lord, in turn, is also the source of immortality (*amṛta*). He, by His glory dispels the inner darkness (ignorance) and gladdens the ever-liberated beings. He is the abode of all the sixty-four fine arts (*sakala*) and is a source of happiness for one and all.

The verse that follows, again through the employment of pun, identifies the Lord's *janmāṣṭamī* marked by the *jayantı* constellation (characterising *Kṛṣṇāvatāra*) with the Vedic lore (*trayī*). The *Veda* has as its source the *tāra* (*Oṃkāra*) which was pronounced by Brahmā (*Padmaja*) first. It has different ways of chanting the texts like *Krama* (*Kramapāṭha*) in the process of its evolution (*avatāra*). In the case of the Lord, He manifested (as Śrī Kṛṣṇa) under the Rohiṇī (*tāra*) constellation which has Brahmā (*Padmaja*) as its presiding deity. He is also known for His commitment to evolve Himself in a series of *avatāra*-s (*avatārakrama*).

In a beautiful *anuṣṭubh* verse that follows, Parāśara identifies Raṅgarāja with *'mahīdhara'* (mountain). The mountain is dark in colour and so also is Raṅgarāja. The Lord Raṅgarāja has a crown (*makuṭa*). The mountain has slopes (*kaṭaka*) and is lofty (*tuṅga*). The mountain is the abode of *sattva*-s (animals). The Lord is the repository of the quality of serenity and enormous strength (*sattva*).

In another verse, Lord Raṅganātha who had just had His bath is fancied as having taken the *avabhṛtasnāna* which marks the completion of a sacrificial undertaking (*savana*). The battle the Lord waged against Rāvaṇa is the *savana.* Naturally all the details of the battle are worked out in the light of this metaphor. The *icchāśakti* of the Lord is the *patnī* (wife) of the sacrificer. The five weapons are the vessels used in the course of the sacrifice. His four arms are the *Ṛtvik*-priests. The offsprings or the descendants of Pulastya (Rāvaṇa and others) are the animals sacrificed. Protection of the virtuous is the fruit (*rakṣā-phalam*).

In verse 26 we find Lord Raṅgarāja identified with the Mandara mountain used by the gods for churning the Ocean. The mountain is seen (used) by gods and *rākṣasa*-s (demons). It is resorted to by *siddha*-s, *cāraṇa*-s and others (who are fond of its slopes). It has seen the production of nectar (*amṛta*), the most precious of all the things brought out of the ocean. Lord Raṅgarāja is also the object of the glances of the gods and demons. He is also resorted to by *siddha*-s and *cāraṇa*-s (who sing His glory) with their hearts full of joy. He is the source of immortality (*amṛta*).

In another verse, Parāśara in his role as the *purohita* of Lord Raṅgarāja[152] informs Him about the auspicious day time, etc., which is most suitable for Him to unite with His consort *Mā* (*Śrī*). The Sun and the Moon are approaching the constellation *śravaṇa.* The day is Sunday and that is admired by all (*sadasi bahumata*). The *puṣya-nakṣatra* has also set in. The brilliance of the Lord is like an ocean and the Lord Himself is a bridge by whose help we can cross over to the other shore.

In the last verse of the *Tirumañjanakavi*-s available to us we have a beautiful imagery concerning the upper

cloth of the Lord. The cloth, white like the autumnal cloud, adorns the dark blue chest of Raṅganātha and resembles the celestial Ganges (which is also white) flowing across the sky which is dark blue in colour (like an *Indranīla)*.

It is clear from the above verses that, they are all stray in character (*muktaka)* and are recited on different occasions, mostly during the ceremony of *abhiṣeka* done to the Lord. Most of these verses employ the figure of speech *Rūpaka* (metaphor) based upon *Śleṣa (śleṣānuprāṇitarūpaka)*.

COMMENTARY OF TIRUNEDUNTĀṆṬAKA (stanza 21)

As noted in the previous chapter, Parāśara was a great exponent of the *Divyaprabandha* and his *nirvāha*-s on several passages of it are quite well-known in the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition. Of special importance is his long and learned exposition on a particular verse *Maivaṇṇanaruṅguñji* (stanza 21) of the celebrated Tiruneḍuntāṇṭaka of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār. Although Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is known to have been a regular exponent of the *Divyaprabandha,* only this particular stanza has received his written exposition. The reason could have been that he was attracted not only by the poetic charm of the verse but also by the fact that the transcendental character (*paratva*) and easy accessibility (*saulabhya*) of the Lord are very beautifully woven into this verse by the mystic poet Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār. Also, perhaps, Parāśara is touched by the reference to the bow wielded by the *nāyaka* described in this verse, which is an unmistakable reference to Śrī Rāma, the celebrated hero of the *Rāmāyaṇa,* dear to the heart of Parāśara. It is also quite evident that the utterances of Saint Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār

are full with the feelings of *nāyikābhāva* that shows the deepest love with her lover, unable to bear even a moment's separation from him. Being a poet himself Parāśara could have naturally been attracted to this particular stanza which gave him ample scope for the delineation of the love-lorn condition of the Āḷvār who was also a poet of extra-ordinary merit.

Introducing his commentary Parāśara gives the context in which the speaker (Āḷvār or Nāyikā) describes her beloved who approached her. The Nāyikā who is now separated from her beloved, goes to a garden in the outskirts of the town under the pretext of gathering some flowers. The Nāyaka who was also pining due to separation from his lady-love comes to the same place under the pretext of hunting some wild animals. They are thus brought together and after sometime the Nāyaka leaves the scene. The verse under discussion is the Nāyikā's expression of the experience she had with her beloved. To be more precise, the Nāyikā tells her confidant that the Nāyaka who with dark curly hair dangling on his shoulders, brilliant ear-ornaments illumining those locks of hair and *vice-versa,* holding the bow as a support. possessed of hands, mouth, eyes and feet resembling red lotuses, stood before her and sprang a surprise as it were. The Nāyikā, knowing fully well that he was afflicted by love for herself, mistook him for a moment though, for the Lord Himself, adding that she was struck with a sense of awe. It is also clear by the way in which the Nāyikā refers to the Nāyaka as wielding the bow and as 'having come along with another' that she is identifying herself with Sītā.

In his introduction Parāśara gives a brief resumé of the entire hymn of *Tiruneḍuntāṇṭakam* which consists of 30 stanzas. These can be divided into three decads

and each decad according to Parāśara can be studied from seven different points of view, all, of course, forming a mutually connected syntactical whole. Basically, says Parāśara, the first decad may be taken as reflecting the mood of the poet himself, while the second projects the idea of the mother of the Nāyikā, and the third expresses the mood and sentiment of the nāyikā herself. He takes the line *maccittāḥ madgataprāṇāḥ bodhayantaḥ parasparam* (*Gītā* X.9a) and explains each decade as expounding the idea conveyed by each of the three expressions respectively containd in this line. Thus the first decad of *Tiruneḍuntāṇṭakam* elaborates the idea conveyed by the *Gītā* expression *maccittāḥ;* the second decad expatiates the idea of *madgataprāṇāḥ* and the third decad elaborates the content of *bodhayantaḥ parasparam.* From another view-point these three decads explain the significance of the *mūlamantra,* the *dvaya* and the *caramaśloka* respectively. On another view, the ideas of *bhakti, prapatti* and *puruṣakāra* are the imports of these decads. According to another explanation, these sections also convey the meanings of the sacred syllable, the term *namas* and the term *nārāyaṇa,* forming part of the *mūlamantra.* Or even within the *praṇava* itself the three components *a, u* and *m* can be brought out by these three sections. On another count these three sections can be interpreted as the illustrations for the expressions *adarśane darśanamātra-kāmāḥ, dṛṣṭvā pariṣvaṅgaṛasaikalolāḥ* and *āliṅgitāyām punarāyatākṣyā āśāsmahe vigrahayorabhedam,* which constitute a verse of the *Śṛṅgāraśataka* (śl. 22) of Bhartṛhari.

What follows then is a detailed account of verse 21 from the several view-points of the third decad. Each and every word of the verse receives the attention of the commentator who is at his best in diving deep into

the fathomless heart of the Āḷvār. A few instances may be cited. The dark curly locks of hair of the Nāyaka are taken up for explanation. Their colour is like that of collyrium and they are also fragrant. Those who apply this collyrium to their eyes will be able to visualise everything. In other words the sight of the dark curls acts as the *siddhāñjana.* These locks touch the shoulders of the Nāyaka and Parāśara explains that the Nāyikā could see only this phenomenon first. The Nāyaka could not face her straight being smitten by love for her and for which reason he himself came there under the pretext of hunting. To keep himself engaged in this pretentious act of hunting, he began to search for the animal in and around the bushes. It is then that our Nāyikā had the first glimpse of the Nāyaka's dangling dark locks of hair touching his shoulders. As for the fragrance of these locks of hair, Parāśara presumes that they must have derived it from, the Tulasī decorating his hair, or acquired it from the garlands offered by Āṇḍāḷ after having decorated herself with them.

The two ear-ornaments of the Nāyaka are described next. They have the motif of fish and by their brilliance they illuminate even the face of the Nāyaka which is otherwise 'dimmed' by his hair. While the ear-ornaments can be of several shapes as those of fish (*makara*), peacock (*mayūra*) and swan (*haṁsa*), the ones decorating the *nāyaka*'s ears are fish-shaped. This, according to Parāśara, shows that *makara* has a special significance with the Nāyaka being the emblem of Manmatha (who is the son of Lord Viṣṇu). Against the black background of the hair these ear-rings are like fish bouncing up in the waves of an ocean. In fact it would be difficult for one to say as to which forms the source of beauty for the other among the hair-locks and the ear-ornaments.

The bow of the Nāyaka is then the subject of description. He came with the bow as his companion, the bow which vanquished the *rākṣasa*-s in the Daṇḍaka forest. Naturally Parāśara loses himself in the particular episode of the *Rāmāyaṇa* where Rāma singlehanded, is said to have killed fourteen thousand *rākṣasa*-s. The *Rāmāyaṇa*-verse, *tam dṛṣṭvā śatruhantāram.,* etc. (*Rāmāyaṇa* III. 39b-40a) is explained in great detail in this context. The Nāyaka brought this bow because he has been pretending to have come on a hunting expedition. Or, being love-sick and unable to stand by himself he used it as a prop. Or, perhaps this is the most powerful weapon the Lord could count upon. Or perhaps he loved it most, for, it was instrument in winning the hand of his bride Sītā in his Rāmāvatāra. In the original stanza we have the expression *iruvarāy vandār* which means 'he came with a second person'. For Parāśara, *iruvarāy* (literally 'as two') suggests the twin qualities of *paratva* (transcendental character) and *saulabhya* (easy accessibility). Or, it points out divinity (*divyatva*) and human nature (*manuṣyatva*); or, the nature of being the means (*upāya*) and the goal (*upeya*), which characterise the nature of the Supreme Being. The bow also represents, according to Parāśara, the presence of Lakṣmaṇa who was providing unfailing company to Rāma.

Tha Nāyaka came and stood before her (*eṉ muṉṉē niṉṟār*). He did so, so that she could have a full view of him. Or, he himself was attracted by her beauty and was struck dumb by it; or he wanted to test her real intention whether she really loves him or hates him.

What follows then is the description of the red lotus-like hands of the Nāyaka. The way Parāśara justifies this description is interesting. According to him the Nāyaka, who was thus placed himself before the Nāyikā,

folds his hands and begs for love (*bhogabhikṣā*). It is then that we have the full view of the palms of his hands. These worthy hands touched the foot of his bride (Sītā) during their wedding; they offer protection to those who believe in His grace; and they seem to forbid men not to indulge in deeds inimical to their spiritual progress.

The description then turns to the mouth of the Nāyaka which also is like a lotus. Since his lady-love stood speechless, he took her silence as a sign of her willingness and uttered a few words, which gives an occasion for the poet to describe the mouth. Parāśara quoting some *vivāhamantra-s* (*imāṁ sameta paśyata,* etc., *Ṛgveda* X.85.33) observes that this is the mouth of the Supreme Lord which uttered the *mantra-s* at the time of marriage. As he uttered the *mantra*-s he gazed at her from top to toe and this provided an opportunity for the Nāyikā to look at his eyes. This naturally leads to the description of the eyes of the Nāyaka which were like a pair of red lotuses blooming in the sky. They seem to talk to the Nāyikā by their gentle and bright glances.

Referring to the feet of the Nāyaka the Āḻvār says *aḍiyum aḥdē* ('the feet were also like that'). Parāśara notes that instead of making a categorical statement that the feet of the Nāyaka were also like lotuses, as is done in the case of his palms, mouth, etc., the Āḻvār simply says 'like that', out of his personal dislike to bring in the lotus as a standard of comparison while describing the different parts of the Nāyaka's body. Parāśara says that the comparison with lotus is *visadṛśa* (unequal), that is, the lotuses are not match at all to the feet etc., of the Lord. It is these feet that roamed in the forest on hilly tracks (even without sandals in the *Rāmāvatāra*) which naturally caused great concern to the Nāyikā (that is, Sītā).

Finally the innumerable perfections such as *vātsalya* (parental concern), *kāruṇya* (compassion), *saulabhya* (easy accessibility), etc., exhibited by the Nāyaka show him off as the Supreme Being glorified in the scriptures. On seeing him the Nāyikā expresses naturally her apprehension about his real identity-that he must be the Supreme Lord Himself who is the ruler of all and is the master of the two *vibhūti*-s. With nobody to clarify her doubt or to allay her sense of awe the Nāyikā expresses her feelings to her confidant which takes us to the end of this verse.

It is thus clear from the detailed study of all the available works of Parāśara that he had an amazing mastery over the sacred lore of both Tamil and Sanskrit traditions (*Ubhaya Vedānta*) and that his compositions, be they original and independent or commentaries, reveal his deep scholarship, frankness of thought and clarity of expression. His *stotra*-s have their own special appeal in terms of religious feeling and poetic grandeur and the succeeding chapter is devoted to a literary study of these *stotra*-s.

CHAPTER IV

LITERARY ESTIMATE OF THE HYMNS OF PARĀŚARA

That Parāśara occupies a high place among the Sanskrit poets is clear by the beautiful *stotra*-s he composed of which the *Śrīraṅgarājastava* is the longest and the most elegant panegyric. The *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* in sixty-one verses is the second longest hymn of his, followed by the *Śrīraṅganātha-stotra* in seven verses. His stray verses known as *Tirumañjanakavi*-s (of which 28 are available) also serve as good illustrations for his literary talent. All these *hymns*, it has to be pointed out, contain a number of philosophical statements also. The *Uttaraśataka* of the *Śrīraṅgarājastava* mostly contains such canonical statements which are characteristic of the Śrīvaiṣṇava religion and philosophy. The present chapter is devoted to a representative illustration and study of the literary merit of these *hymns*. Parāśara's *Aṣṭaślokī* is not included in this study by reason of its thorough philosophic nature.

PARĀŚARA'S CONCEPT OF POETRY

According to Parāśara, a poet is one who by his command of good vocabulary and elegant style can bring out the merits of the object or person he undertakes to describe. One who does not have these required eligibilities cannot do justice to his undertaking. It is also implied that one who does not make a proper choice of topic also falls short of the estimate of critics.[1] A proper choice of words capable of conveying the intended ideas and sentiments according to Parāśara can be acquired through divine grace.[2] Such a composition is sure to

meet the approval of accomplished poets and connoisseurs of art. Parāśara makes repeated reference to the choice of words which characterise a first-rate poem. He also seems to contribute to the view that a *kāvya* should be free from blemishes and possess many qualities.

anāghrātāvadyaṁ bahuguṇaparīṇāhi manaso
duhānaṁ sauhārdaṁ paricitamivāthāpi gahanam
padānāṁ saubhrātrādanimiṣaniṣevyaṁ śravaṇayoḥ
tvameva śrīrmhyaṁ bahumukhaya vāṇīvilasitam
(*Śrīguṇaratnakośa (SGRK)* - śl. 8)

It is significant that this verse reminds one of the definition of *Kāvya* given by Mammaṭa in his *Kāvyaprakāśa.*[3] In fact, Nārāyaṇa the commentator on the *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* quotes the relevant passage of the *Kāvyaprakāśa* in support of this view. Chronologically also, Parāśara succeeded Mammaṭa (10th cent. A.D.). Parāśara also speaks of a particular trait of a good poem, namely, its capacity to transport the mind of the listner to a world of joy. This is in fact the most important feature of a *kāvya.* This is what Mammaṭa has called, while enumertating the benefits of a *kāvya, sadyaḥ paranirvṛti.* The words of a Mahākavi have another feature. They appear to be familiar to the readers but they assume magnanimous dimensions and unfathomable depths once a critical mind tries to understand the full significance of these words. This is what he calls *paricitamivāthāpi gahanam.* There should be among the words, a close affinity and cohesion (*padānām saubhrātram*). This may be called *śayyā* or *pāka* which consists in a judicious juxtaposition of words in such a way that the words do not allow any substitution or change. The total effect of such a composition will be that it is sweet to hear again and again (*animiṣaniṣevyam śravaṇayoḥ*). The expression *bahuguṇaparīṇāhi* also suggests that according to Parāśara a good poem should

also have the *guṇa*-s such as *prasāda, ojas* and *samatā.*

THE GUṆA-S PRESENT IN THE HYMNS

Although several *guṇa*-s can be identified in the hymns of Parāśara only a few of them are illustrated hereunder:

(a) *Prasāda*

Of all the *guṇa*-s which mark good poetry irrespective of the presence of *bhāva*-s and *rasa*-s, *Prasāda* ('clarity of word and meaning') is very important. Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* stresses the importance of this one quality of poetry as the first requisite.[4] It is also worth noting that he refers to the same condition while providing the fullfledged definition of *dhvani.*[5] The word *sphuṭatvena* (with clarity) in the definition of *Dhvani* conveys the same idea of *Prasāda.*

This verse which describes the *audārya* (magnanimity) of Mother Lakṣmī is a beautiful illustration for the quality of *Prasāda:*

aiśvaryaṁ akṣaragatiṁ paramaṁ padaṁ vā
kasmaicid aṅjalibharaṁ vahate vitīrya
asmai na kiñciducitaṁ kṛtamityathāmba
tvaṁ lajjase kathaya ko'yamudārabhāvaḥ
(*SGRK* - śl. 58)

Another example is the following verse:

kadā'haṁ kāverīvimalasalile vītakaluṣo
bhaveyaṁ tattīre śramamuṣi vaseyaṁ ghanavane
kadā vā taṁ puṇye mahati puline maṅgalaguṇam
bhajeyaṁ raṅgeśaṁ kamalanayanaṁ śeṣaśayanam
(*Śrīraṅganāthastava (SRNS)* - śl. 1)

(b) *Ojas*

This consists in the capacity of the composition to 'kindle' the mind of a reader or listener. This is normally effected through long compounds although this is not always the rule.[6]

The verse describing Lord Raṅganātha's throat with the lines thereon is a good instance in point:

ramayatu sa māṁ kaṇṭhaḥ śrīraṅganeturudañcita-
kramukataruṇagrīvākambupralambamalimlucaḥ
praṇayavilagallakṣmīviśvambharākarakandalī-
kanakavalayakrīḍāsaṅkrāntarekha ivollasan
(*Śrīraṅgarājastava (SRJS)* I.104)

Another instance is the following verse describing Lord Narasiṁha in all his fury as He tore open the chest of His enemy, splashing and besmearing the blood on his manes and shoulders.

dviṣāṇadveṣodyannayanavanavahnipraśamana-
bhramallakṣmīvaktraprahitamadhugaṇḍūṣasuṣamaiḥ
nakhakṣuṇṇārātikṣatajapaṭalairāplutasaṭā-
cchaṭāskandho rundhe duritamiha puṁspañcavadanaḥ
(*SRJS.* II. 65)

(c) *Samatā*

This quality which consists in balanced expressions[7] may be illustrated in the following verse:

āyatkirīṭamalikollasadūrdhvapuṇḍram-
ākarṇalocanamanaṅkuśakarṇapāśam
utphullavakṣasamudāyudhabāhumarhan-
nīviṁ ca raṅgapatimabjapadaṁ bhajāmaḥ
(*SRJS* I.73)

Another illustration is the following verse from the same *stotra*.

namaḥ śrīraṅganāyakyai yadbhrūvibhramabhedataḥ
iśeśitavyavaiṣamya-nimnonnatamidaṁ jagat (I.7)

(d) *Kānti*

This quality consists in a very elegant composition.[8] The illustrations is:

abjanyastapadābjamañcitakaṭīsaṁvādikauśeyakaṁ
kiñcittāṇḍavagandhisaṁhananakaṁ
nirvyājamandasmitam
cūḍācumbimukhāmbujaṁ nijabhujāviśrāntadivyāyudhaṁ
śrīraṅge śaradaśśataṁ tata itaḥ paśyema lakṣmīsakham
(*SRJS* I.74)

One more instance is from the *SGRK* (śl. 3):

anukalatanukāṇḍāliṅganārambhaśumbhat-
pratidiśabhujaśākhaśrīsakhānokaharddhiḥ
stananayanagulucchasphārapuṣpadvirephā
racayatu mayi lakṣmīkalpavallī katākṣān

(e) *Suśabdatā*

The quality called *Suśabdatā* (or *Sauśabdya*) comprises the employment of refined words and expressions.[9] We can illustrate several verses for this quality from the works of Parāśara of which the following is only a representative selection.

aravinditamaṅghripāṇivaktrair-
api tāpiñchitamañcitāṅgakāntyā
adhareṇa sabandhujīvitaṁ śrīḥ
(*SRJS* I.84)

unmūlyāhara mandarādrimahinā taṁ saṁbadhānāmunā
dorbhiścañcalamālikaiśca dadhinirmāthaṁ
mathānāmbudhistet
śrīraṅgeśvara candrakaustubhasudhāpūrvaṁ gṛhāṇeti te
kurvāṇasya phalegrahirhi kamalālābhena sarvaḥ śramaḥ
(*Ibid,* II.55)

śailo'gniśca jalāmbabhūva munayo mūḍhāmbabhūvurjaḍāḥ
prājñāmāsuragāssagopamamṛtāmāsur mahāśīviṣāḥ
govyāghrāssahajāmbabhūvurapare tvanyāmbabhūvuḥ
prabho
tvaṁ teṣvanyatamāmbabhūvitha
bhavadveṇukvaṇonmādane
(*Ibid.* II.72)

FIGURES OF SPEECH

(a) *ŚABDĀLAṄKĀRA-S*

Alaṅkāra-s are two-fold as those belonging to the sound (*śabda*) and sense (*artha*). Of the *śabdālaṅkāra*-s *anuprāsa* (alliteration) is quite frequently used by our author. Although the *yamaka* and the *bandha* types also belong to this category great poets consciously avoid them for the simple reason that a lot of effort is needed for their composition which makes them more artificial.

A few instances for *Anuprāsa* may be cited from Parāśara's works:

sūktim samagrayatu naḥ svayameva lakṣmīḥ
śrīraṅgarājamahiṣī madhuraiḥ kaṭākṣaiḥ
vaidagdhyavarṇaguṇagumbhanagauravairyāṁ
kaṇḍūlakarṇakuharāṁ kavayo dhayanti
(*SGRK,* śl. 7)

kastūrīkalitordhvapuṇḍratilakaṁ karṇāntalolekṣaṇaṁ
mugdhasmeramanoharādharadalaṁ muktākirīṭojjvalam

paśyanmānasapaśyatohararucaḥ paryāyapaṅkeruhaṁ
śrīraṅgādhipateḥ kadā nu vadanaṁ seveya
bhūyo'pyaham
(*SRNS* śl. 2)

asti vastvidamitthantva-prasaṅkhyāna-parāṅmukham
śrīmatyāyatane lakṣmīpada-lākṣaikalakṣaṇam
(*SRJS* I.9)

(b) *ARTHĀLAṄKĀRA-S*

Of the Figures of Speech of sense, only the most prominent figures may be mentioned:

(i) Upamā

In the *SRJS* (I.8) Lord Raṅganātha reclining on he lap of Ananta is compared to the Cintāmaṇi-gem which is 'brought out' *as it were,* by the huge serpent tself. In another verse of SRJS (I. 63) the Lord is likened o a pond containing fullblown lotuses in which sport he royal she-swan namely Lakṣmī and her shadow, the lark Bhūmi.

(ii) Utprekṣā

This Figure of Speech can be met with in almost ll the hymns of Parāśara. In a verse of *SRJS* (I.80) he dark complexion of the Lord reclining on the serpent within the dark *sanctum sanctorum* is fancied to be n ocean 'drunk in' by a cloud, a mountain placed in n ocean and an elephant reclining in the bushy tracks f a mountain. Several verses of *Tirumañjanakavi*-s form

Raṅganātha to be a river resorted to by several *rājahaṁsa*-s beautiful with *abja* and attended upon by *marudgaṇa*-s.

(iii) Rūpaka

Metaphor is the Figure of Speech often employed by Parāśara. In his *SRJS* (I.16) Parāśara identifies the Lord who has so far been 'bathed' by the Saṁskṛta and Tamil compositions, with a young elephant which may again desire to spray himself with dust in the form of Parāśara's hymns.

(iv) Śleṣa:

Several verses of Paraśara's *Tirumañjanakavi*-s form the illustration for this Figure of Speech. For instance, verse 2 which fancies Lord Raṅganātha to be river *(nada)* and verse 3 identifying Him with a *Suradruma* (celestial boon-yielding tree) employ *Śleṣa* which forms the basis for the Rūpaka also. The expressions *anuvṛtti, rājahaṁsa, aṇḍajāta, abja, sumarudguṇa,* etc., of verse 2 have each two meanings. Likewise in verse 3, the words *śākhā, suparṇa* and *sumanas* also have two meanings each.

METRES EMPLOYED

Parāśara has employed 45 kinds of metres in all his available *stotra*-s, containing a total of 337 verses. Of these, the majority of verses are in the *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre (55) followed by *Vasantatilakā* (43), *Śikhariṇī* (34),*Mālinī* (31), *Sragdharā* (25), *Hariṇī* (16), *Anuṣṭubh* (14), *Indravajrā* (12), *Mandākrāntā* (10) and *Upajāti* (10). Of the remaining metres mention may be made of a few rare ones like *Kusumitalatāvellita, Kalahaṁsa, Prastārikā, Bhramaravilasita, Mattā, Mandākinī, Manjubhāṣiṇī, Mattamañjarī, Mālabhāriṇī, Yugmayugala, Rukmavatī, Rucirā* and *Śaśikalā.*

PARĀŚARA'S SCHOLARSHIP

Any one who has even a cursory glance of Parāśara's works will be amazed by the wide range of his scholarship, apart from his remarkable mastery over Sanskrit and Tamil literatures, and by his fine gift for poetry. His mastery of *Vyākaraṇa-śāstra* and his love for highly refined grammatical expressions are quite evident from all his works. Parāśara is one of the foremost writers of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition whose devotional fervour is perfectly matched by his poetical style. Thus while referring to *Rāmāvatāra* in the *VSB* he states: *atha mṛtasañjīvanaṁ rāmacaritam.*[10] Explaining the word *Śubhekṣaṇa* he says, *evaṁ vidhaiśvaryaśīlātiśayapiśuna- śītala - viśālodāra dīrgharājīvalocanaḥ.* To express his poetic bent of mind, the following sentences may also be cited:

divyavallyā iva kalpadrumaḥ, tasyaḥ nityopaghanaḥ
(C. on the name *Śrīnivāsa,* no. 614)

ratnamañjarīva mañjūṣāyāṁ śrīḥ asmin nihitā
(C. on the name *Śrīnidhiḥ,* no. 615)

That Parāśara's knowledge of other schools of thought is quite deep is clear from the refutation of those schools found in his works. The systems refuted are: *Cārvāka* (*SRJS.* II.6), Buddhism (*SRJS* II 6-10; *SGRK* II), Jainism (*SRJS.* II.12a, b), *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* (*SRJS.* II.13), *Sāṅkhya-Yoga* (*SRJS* II.14-15, 30; VSB, name no. 173), *Mīmāṁsā as* represented by the Bhāṭṭa-s and Prābhākara-s (*SRJS* II.20-22; VSB, name no. 175) and Advaita (*SRJS.* II.11, 16; *VSB* names no.1, 64, 303).

HIS PROFICIENCY IN GRAMMAR

The following instances may be given to demonstrate Parāśara's perfect mastery of the Pāṇinian grammar.[11]

(i) abhraṁlihaḥ (*SRJS* I.119)

This word which literally means 'licking the cloud', is formed by adding the suffix *khaś* after the verb *liḥ* when the words *vaha* ('the shoulder of an ox') or *abhra* ('a cloud'), by the rule *vahābhre lihaḥ* (*Aṣṭā.* III.ii.32).

(ii) aruntuda (*SRJS* II.73)

This word meaning wounding the vital parts is formed by the rule *vidhvaruṣastudaḥ* (i.ii.35). According to this the affix *khaś* is added to the verb *tud* ('a wound') when the words *vidhu* ('moon') and *arus* ('vital part') are in composition with it in the objective case.

(iii) āḍhyaṁbhaviṣṇuḥ (*SRJS* II.15)

This word meaning, 'becoming rich' ('regarding one who was not originally rich') is formed by the rule *kartari bhuvaḥ khiṣṇuc-khukañau* (*Aṣṭā* III.ii.57). According to this when the word to be formed denotes an agent, the affixes *khiṣṇuc* and *khukañ* are added after the verb *bhū* (to become) when it is in composition with words *āḍhya, subhaga, sthūla,* etc., provided these have the sense of the words formed by the affix *cvi* though they are not ending in *cvi.* On the same principle is to be understood the expression *apriyam bhaviṣṇuḥ* (*SRJS* II.49).

(iv) ātmambharayaḥ (*SRJS.* II.37, 83)

This word meaning, 'those who feed their own stomachs' that is, 'those who are selfish' is granted by the rule *phalegrahirātmambhariśca* (III.ii.26). This states that the *phalegrahi* and *ātmambhari* are *nipāta*-s (irregularly formed). The word *phalegrahi* meaning 'the fruit-bearing' (and such as, 'a tree') is also found in *SRJS* II.55.

(v) kaṇehatya (*SRJS.* II.38)

This word means 'to one's heart's content' or 'till one is satisfied' is formed by the rule *kaṇemanasī śraddhāpratīghāte* (I.iv.66). This means that the words *kaṇe* and *manas* are *gati*-words when they are in composition with the verb and are used in the sense of 'reaction by satiation'.

(vi) karṇejapa (*SRJS.* I.108)

This word means 'a tale-bearer' or 'one who always whispers into the ears' and it is sanctioned by the Pāṇinian rule *stambakarṇayoḥ ramijapoḥ* (II.ii.13). This means that the affix *ac* comes after the roots *ram* (to whisper) when the case-inflected words *stamba* (a clump of grass) and *karṇa* (ear) are in composition with them respectively.

(vii) kūlamudvaha (*SRJS.* I.100; *SGRK.* śl. 41)

This word means 'carrying away the bund'. This is formed by the rule *udikūle rujivahoḥ* (III.ii.31). This means that the affix *khaś* comes after the verb *ruji* (to break into pieces) and *vah* (to carry) when preceded by the preposition *ut* and when the word *kūla* (bank) is in composition with them as the object.

(viii) kṣemaṅkara (*SRJS.* I.70)

This word means 'propitious' is formed by the rule *kṣema-priya-madre aṇ ca* (III.ii.44). According to this, the affix *aṇ* and *khac* come after the verb *kṛ* (to make) when the words *kṣema* (happiness), *priya* (pleasant) and *madra* (joy) are in composition, in the objective case.

(ix) coralāvaṁ vilāvyaḥ (*SRJS.* II.6)

This expression means 'he has to be beheaded like thief'. This is sanctioned by the rule *upamāne karmaṇi*

ca (III.iv.45) which means that the affix *ṇamul* comes after a root when an object or an agent denoting similitude is in composition with it. It may also be noted that *ṇamul* is added after a verbal root when reiteration is to be expressed. The *sūtra* which allows this is *ābhīkṣṇye ṇamul ca* (III.iv.22).

Other expressions which are governed by this rule are *mūkalāyaṁ nililye* (*SRJS.* II.35) ('kept quiet like a dumb person'), *'nidhinidhāyaṁ nyadhāyiṣata'* (*SRJS.* II.36) ('preserved like a treasure') and *'dadhi- nirmāthaṁ-mathāna* (*SRJS.* II.55) ('churned like curds').

(x) jīvanāśaṁ naśyati (*SRJS.* II.93)

This expression means 'he (she or it) perishes so that the life gets extinguished', that is, dies away. The aphorism *kartroḥ jīvapuruṣayornaśivahoḥ* (III.iv.43), which means that the affix *ṇamul* comes after the roots *naś* (to perish) *vah* (to carry) when the words *jīva* (life) and *puruṣa* (person) expressing the agent of these verbs are respectively in construction with them.

(xi) viśvasmai tiṣṭhamānam (*SRJS.* I.75)

This word means 'one who is indicating his intentions to the entire universe'. The aphorism *prakāśana-stheyākhyayośca* (I.iii.23) grants this. After the verb *sthā* when meaning 'to indicate one's intentions to another; or 'to make an award as an arbitrator', the *Ātmanepada* affix is employed. Accordingly we have *tiṣṭhamāna,* the *Ātmanepada* form of the root *sthā* which is otherwise a *Parasmaipada* root.

(xii) mālabhāri (*SRJS.* I.56)

This word means 'possessor or wearer of many garlands'. The word *mālā* becomes *a*-ending by the

rule *iṣṭakeṣīkāmālānām cita-tūla-bhāriṣu* (VI.iii.65). According to this, the words *iṣṭakā, iṣīkā* and *mālā,* and expressions having these words at the end will have their final vowel shortened when followed by *cita, tūla* and *bhāra* respectively.

(xiii) mitampaca: (*SRJS.* II.105)

This word means 'cooking a little' or 'being niggardly' or 'worthless', it is formed by the rule *mitanakhe ca* (III.ii.34). According to this the affix *khaś* is employed after the verb *pac* (to cook) when the words *mita* (a small quantity) or *nakha* (nail) are in composition with it in the objective case.

(xiv) lunīhi lunīhīti lunīhi (*SRJS.* II.73)

This word means 'you cut repeatedly' (as if some one was always calling to you, 'cut thou, cut thou'). This is sanctioned by the rule *kriyāsamabhihāre loṭ hisvau vā tadhvamoḥ* (III.iv.2). This means: 'when the frequency or repetition of an action is indicated, the affix *loṭ* is added to the root and the verb is repeated. The affixes *hi* and *sva,* or the affixes (-*a* and *dhvam* are the substitutes of *loṭ*). In other words when the repetition of an action is expressed the imperative is used and though the second person singular is used, it also stands for the second person plural.

(xv) sugatapāśaḥ (*SRJS.* II.6)

This word means 'the contemptible Sugata'. This usage is on the authority of *'yāpye pāśap'* (V.iii.47). According to this aphorism, the suffix *pāśap* is added to a word when the meaning of 'contempt' is to be conveyed.

(xvi) surājambhava (*SRJS.* II.15; *SGRK* 11)

This word means 'the state of being a monarch in an easy or effortless way'. This is granted by the rule *kartṛkarmaṇośca bhū-kṛñoḥ* (II.iii.127). This means that the affix *khal* comes after the verbs *bhū* and *kṛñ* when the *upapada*-s in composition with them are an agent or an object, preceded by the words *īṣat,* etc., meaning hard or light, etc.

(xvii) svāgatikaiḥ (*SRJS.* III.75)

This word means 'one who says welcome' is formed by the rule *svāgatādīnāṁ ca* (VII.iii.7). The words read in this group *(gaṇa)* do not take the suffix *aic.* They take the suffix *ṭhak* when the words are in composition with them in the objective case.

RARE USAGES

We also find a few interesting rare usages of words in the *Śrīraṅgarājastava.*

kaṭākṣaṇam

This word (II.43) which usually means 'looking' or 'casting glances' is used here in the sense of 'being dependent on' or 'standing in need of'.

caitrī (*SRJS.* II.30)

This is used in the sense of *'citrasya bhāvaḥ* ('state of being variegated', that is, 'having different varieties').

Jāgaryā (*SRJS.* II.75)

This means 'wakefulness'. This is an alternate form

jāgarteḥ akāro vā read under the Pāṇinian rule *icch* (III.ii.101). This *Vārttika* means, 'From the root *jāg* we have either *jāgarā* or *jāgaryā*. The first is formed by the affix, *'a'* and the latter by *śa* which brings in *yak'*.

Durlalita (*SRJS.* I.17)

This is used in the sense of 'naughtiness' or 'ill-mannered behaviour'.

Padma

This word meaning lotus which is popularly used in neuter gender, is used by our author in the masculine gender eg. *nābhīpadmaḥ* (*SRJS* I.116-117) and *pādapadmau* (*Ibid.* I.123).

Prahati

This word *Prahati* (*SRJS* I.27) is used in the sense of 'proficiency' or 'scholarship'. This would be traced to the root *'han'* (second conjugation) meaning *himsā* and *gati* of which the latter becomes relevant here (Thus, *prakṛṣṭā hatiḥ* becomes *prahatiḥ*).

Pradiḥ

The word *pradiḥ* (*SRJS* II.47) conveys the sense of a 'present' or 'gift'. This is formed by adding the affix *ki* after a *ghu*-verb when an *upasarga* is in composition with it.

Bhramaraka

The word *bhramaraka* (*SRJS* I.94) is used in the sense of a 'curl of hair on the forehead'.

Makaroddhau (*SRJS* I.102)

Here the word *uddha* is added to *makarā* in the sense of 'beautiful' or 'grand' ('ear-rings shaped like makara-fish').[13]

Mṛgyamadhyastha

This word is a technical one meaning 'one who is ready to take an oath'. Parāśara uses this word in his *Tirumañjanakavi*-s (*śl.* 1) while describing the idol of Lord Raṅganātha when He is given the sacred ablutions. The *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* (II.22.95) refers to a practice which is known as *divya* in which a person making claims or declarations in good faith takes an oath wearing wet clothes, a garland of the basil leaves and the like.

Rājakula

This means a 'high family'. The word *rājan* becomes the first member according to the rule *rājadantādiṣu param* (II.ii.31). Thus *kulānāṁ rājā* becomes *rājakulam.*

Rodhaḥ (*SRJS.* II.52)

This word means 'an impediment'. Normally this is used along with the prepositions *upa, ava, ni,* etc.

Vikṛṇoṣi (*SRJS.* II.33)

This is used in the sense of *vikaroṣi* ('you bring about modification' or 'change'). This is derived from the fifth conjugational root *kṛñ hiṁsāyām,* prefixed by the preposition *vi.*

Sañcāraḥ (*SRJS.* II.17)

This word has the sense of *pralaya* ('cosmic dissolution').

SOME NYĀYAS (MAXIMS) USED IN THE ŚRĪRAṄGARĀJASTAVA

Parāśara in his *Śrīraṅgarājastava* uses some *nyāya*-s.

(a) Kośakāranyāya (II.93)

This is the illustration of a cocoon. A silk-worm weaves its web *(kośa)* around its own self in such a way that it gets arrested in it and is eventually killed.

(b) Daṇḍāpūpikānyāya (II.47)

This is also known as *Kaimutika-nyāya.* This maxim of 'stick and the cakes' is used to convey the sense of some event which is presumed to have taken place on the strength of another happening. If some cakes are tied to a stick and if the stick itself is carried away or eaten up by mice or some other animals, the inference is that the cakes have shared the same fate.

(c) Mīnapānīyanyāya (II.105)

This is the maxim of 'pouring water to a fish which is already in water'. This conveys the idea of doing a thing which is not required or which is redundant.

(d) Sitākṣīranyāya (II. 64)

This is the illustration of 'adding sugar to milk', which makes it all the more delicious. Mere sugar by itself or milk alone may not be liked by many. A happy combination of these two makes both enjoyable.

(e) Jalasthala (I.124) (from ajalasthalajña)

Parāśara uses what may be called an idiom, *ajalasthalajña,* literally meaning, 'one who does not

distinguish between water and ground, that is, between the low and the high, between the rich and the poor (This is used with reference to Kṛṣṇa).

An Unclear Idea

In one verse (*SRJS.* II.65) Parāśara fancies the blood gushing forth from the chest of Hiraṇyakaśipu to be the spittings of the red *tāmbūla,* done by Lakṣmī, in order to pacify the fire of Lord Narasiṁha's anger. The idea however, is not quite clear or appealing. The blood coming out of the demon's chest rent asunder by the Lord's sharp nails is imagined to be the *tāmbūlarasa,* spat out on the demon by Lakṣmī, not only by way of expressing Her contempt for him, but also to pacify the Lord indirectly. The pacification of the Lord's anger was extremely difficult and nobody including Lakṣmī could approach Lord Narasiṁha in such an enraged condition Parāśara perhaps felt that spitting on the enemy may prove effective in its own way in bringing down His fury. But what is difficult to understand is the next statement of the poet that the Lord's manes and shoulder were besmeared by such a blood, which has been fancied to be the spittings of Lakṣmī.

Thus a literary estimate of the *hymn*-s of Parāśara embedded by philosophical and doctrinal ideas reveal Parāśara to be a very facile poet of no mean merit The philosophical and doctrinal ideas as could be gathered from his works will be taken up in the succeeding chapter

CHAPTER V
PHILOSOPHICAL STUDY

Parāśara Bhaṭṭa is one of the leading writers on the Śrīvaiṣṇava school of thought. All his compositions bear ample evidence to this fact. As one who occupied a pre-eminent position after Śrī Rāmānuja, he commanded great respect as is evident from a number of reverential references made to him by no less a person than Vedānta Deśika himself.[1] In several places where there seems to be a contradiction in the available text of the *Tattvaratnākara* with some well-known concepts of this school, Vedānta Deśika tries to explain it away without criticising or contradicting Parāśara. While Vedānta Deśika quotes very long tracts from the *Tattvaratnākara,*[2] it is quite obvious that even Vedānta Deśika did not have the full text of it before him. He clearly states that the *prameya* section of it was lost.[3] The loss of this monumental philosophical treatise of the great ācārya is great no doubt; but yet his other compositions like the *Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa,* the three *stotra-s* and the *Aṣṭaślokī,* enable us to arrive at a more or less clear picture of Parāśara's philosophical position. An approach to a study of the Śrīvaiṣṇava school should be guided by two considerations which are very fundamental to an understanding of this system: (1) that it is not merely a philosophy; and (2) that it is not purely religious. Viśiṣṭādvaita can best be understood as a religious philosophy. An attempt is made in this chapter to gather the ideas and concepts as are available in all these works.

EPISTEMOLOGY

From the available passages of the *Tattvaratnākara*

and nature of the *pramāṇa*-s accepted by him. *Pratyakṣa* (perception), *Anumāna* (inference) and *Āgama* (verbal knowledge, also called *aitihya* by Parāśara) are the three *pramāṇa*-s accepted by the Viśiṣṭādvaitin. *Smṛti* (recollection), though recognised by some as a distinct means, Parāśara feels that it can be included in its own source (namely, the *anubhava* produced by the three *pramāṇa*-s). In this context it has to be stated that even *Pratibhā* (revelation) is claimed as a separate *prāmaṇa* by some. Parāśara does not accept this. (Though it is true that one can realise the reality of things through *Pratibhā,* it is useful only in the case of pious people.).

Dependence upon *liṅga* (characteristic mark) and *śabda* make the knowledge derived out of them, *parokṣa* (indirect) in nature. As contrasted with this, if the knowledge concerning an object is direct without any mediacy, it becomes *aparokṣa* (immediate).

Pratyakṣa is classified as determinate *(savikalpaka)* and indeterminate *(nirvikalpaka),* in the traditional manner characteristic of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school. The presence of *anuvṛtti* (continuity) or *pratyavamarśa* (retrospection) characterises the *savikalpaka-pratyakṣa.* In the *nirvikalpaka,* however, though this feature is absent still the configuration of the individual seen for the first time qualifies the knowledge. It is therefore, not a bare knowledge. From another view-point perception is sub-divided as that which belongs to the ancients *(anarvācīna-yogin-s)* and that which belongs to the ordinary people *(arvācīna).*

Another view expressed by Parāśara in the context of the *pramāṇa*-s is that *pratyakṣa* does not cognize the 'bare existence or being' *(sanmātra)* of an entity.

Knowledge by its very nature is self-luminous *(svyamprakāśa).* It is not inferred through features like

prākaṭya (manifestedness) or through mental perceptio *(mānasa-pratyakṣa).*

According to Parāśara inference involves the mediac of knowledge *(parokṣa). Vyāpti* (invariable concomitance which is the main feature of *anūmana* can be understoo even through a single observation. *Bhūyodarśan* (repeated observation) is not necessary. This invariabl concomitance becomes vitiated in the presence o *upādhi*-s (adventitious condition). A reason *(liṅga)* whicl has an incomplete character *(rūpavaikalya)* has an *upādh* and a reason which has lack of correspondence *(vyabhicāra)* also has an *upādhi.* The former type o reason is known as *aprayojaka* and the latter has the usual classification of *bādhita, viruddha, anaikāntika,* etc.

Kevalavyatirekin, though it seems to have been accepted as a variety of *anumāna* by Parāśara, was not really acceptable to him. The usual classification of *anumāna* as *svārtha* and *parārtha* is also discussed by Parāśara. Strictly speaking, there is no element of *parārtha* in the so- called *parārtha*-type of inference. All inferences operate and attain their validity on the basis of *vyāpti.* Validity is not specially conferred upon them by the fact that somebody addresses a syllogism to another.

In this context it is also to be noted that according to Parāśara all *pramāṇa*-s gain their validity purely on the spontaneous functioning of the totality of their causes, which proves their intrinsic nature *(svataḥprāmāṇya).* Sometimes this totality of causes *(sāmagrī)* may be found in the form of a sentence uttered by one person to another. This is the real basis for the two-fold classification of inference. As a sequel to this is the view regarding the number of the members of a syllogism in the

members, Parāśara, following the Rāmānuja school states that there is no hard and fast rule regarding the exact number. If a reliable person tells some one *dhūmavān agnimāneva* ('that which has smoke certainly has fire'), there is no need for the illustration *(dṛṣṭānta)* also. The most important point is that *vyāpti* must be properly conveyed. There is no need also to mention *pratijñā, hetu* and *udāharaṇa* in the traditional order of enumeration.

Another opinion of Parāśara is that *tarka* (indirect argument) need not be accorded any undue importance in the scheme of *pramāṇa*-s. Some are of the view, says Parāśara, that all valid means of knowledge are at the mercy of *tarka. Tarka* must be shown its right place. It just helps one to remove doubts that may arise due to the contradictions *(virodha)* or non-apprehensions *(abodha)* while apprehending an object. Certainly it has no independent power to confer validity on inference or any other means of knowledge.

Arthāpatti (presumption) is, according to Parāśara, a variety of inference. It is not an independent *pramāṇa.*

THE TWO MĪMĀṀSĀ-S CONSTITUTING A SINGLE SCIENCE

One of the basic convictions of this school is that both the *Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtra*-s of Jaimini and the *Uttaramīmāṁsā* (the *Brahmasūtra*) of Bādarāyaṇa form a single cogent unit, of which the opening *sūtra* is *athāto dharmajijñāsā* and the last *sūtra* is *anāvṛttiḥ śabdāt anāvṛttiḥ śabdāt.* This is the view expressed by Rāmānuja in his *Śrībhāṣya.*[4] It is interesting to note that while supporting this view, Parāśara mentions that the *karma-kāṇḍa, devatā-kāṇḍa* and *brahma-kāṇḍa* were

:reated by Jaimini, Kāśakṛtsna and Bādarāyaṇa :espectively, in their aphorisms.[5]

ΓATTVATRAYA

The three principles accepted in this system are *cit*, *acit* and Īśvara which constitute a single unit by virtue ɔf *cit* and *acit* forming the *śarīra* of the Lord who is heir soul. In his *stotra*-s and the commentary on the *Viṣṇusahasranāma*, Parāśara has emphasised the concept ɔf *Tattvatraya*. In the *SRJS* (I.115) Parāśara states that he Lord has within Himself the entire universe of *cit* ınd *acit*, each containing within itself a three-fold :lassification *(trividha-cidacid-bṛndam)*. The three-fold :lassification of cit is: *baddha* (the bound souls), *mukta* the liberated) and *nitya* (the ever-liberated); with eference to the *acit* (insentient matter) this classification s: *śuddha-sattva* (the pure *sattva*) (which constitutes the hings to be found in the highest abode of the Lord .nd also the 'divine abodes of the Lord on earth'), *niśrasattva* (the mixed *sattva*) and *sattvaśūnya* (that which ; devoid of *sattva*).

In another verse of the same *stotra*, Parāśara again nentions the *cit-acit* complex having the Lord as its upreme and eternal ruler (II 25: *'śrutiḥ cidacitī..'* etc). n his *VSB*, Parāśara again mentions the *Tattvatraya* while xplaining the name *puruṣottamaḥ* (name no. 24) and lso the name *pradhānapuruṣeśvaraḥ* (name no. 20). This ıtter name clearly mentions *pradhāna (acit)* and Puruṣa *cit)* as controlled by Īśvara.

:REATION OF THE UNIVERSE

Speaking about the creation of the Universe, Parāśara

remarkable will *(icchā)* of the Lord.[6] The Lord is Omniscient and is not a mere witness or a passive spectator. His remarkable Lordship consists in His total independence and absolute control over everything with no other extraneous force directing Him. The creation of the universe, Parāśara makes it clear, is in accordance with the peculiar *karman (karmavaicitrī)* of the individual souls concerned. This, however, does not impair the Lord's independence.[7] In another statement, Parāśara says that the creation of the universe which consists in alloting different kinds of bodies to creatures in accordance with their own *karma,* points only to the Lord's remarkable compassion for them. Otherwise, they would have been lying without any distinction of name and form from matter which is insentient, at the time of cosmic dissolution. It is only out of His own free will *(icchā)* and inability to bear the sight of the sad plight of the creatures that He made *prakṛti* evolve into different *tattva*-s.[8] At the time of cosmic dissolution the universe of *cit* and *acit* becomes dormant *(pralaya-samaya-suptam)* in a very minute part of His own body. When He so wills He would effortlessly project the *cit* and *acit* like a peacock spanning out his beautiful tail.[9]

CREATION AS THE SPORT OF THE LORD

In his *VSB,* Parāśara while explaining the name *pradhānapuruṣeśvaraḥ* (name no. 20) points out that the entire cosmic activity of creation, sustenance and dissolution is but a mere sport for the Lord. By His own *māyā* (wonderful power) the Lord binds those beings who stray away from the path of virtue. Again He releases those who surrender to Him.

This sport of the Lord is meant to please His consort Lakṣmī. Accordingly in his *SGRK* (śl. 19) Parāśara

observes that when the time is ripe for the *cit* and *ac* to come into contact with each other, the Lord create 'cosmic eggs' by thousands and provides different varietie of sense-organs, bodies and the like to the sentient beings This is but to please His consort. Already in the *SRJ.* (II.44) reference had been made to the Lord's creatin; the universe even as a peacock spreads out his tail an(dancing in the company of Śrī. This concept of *krīḍ* is normally brought in by the writers of the Viśiṣṭādvait school to explain the total independence and absolut control the Supreme Being has over the world of *ci* and *acit.*

THE ROLE OF KARMA

Closely connected with the concept o world-manifestation is the law of *Karma.* The questior of man's responsibility for his own actions and the place of God's will in relation to it is quite well-known. According to the Viśiṣṭādvaita school although the Lord is all-powerful and compassionate, the responsibility of a man in making or marring his own future cannot be ignored or even under estimated. If the world in which we are living is full of misery and is apparently beset by all kinds of imperfections it is all the making of man himself; and God is not to be blamed. The *Brahmasūtra* has clearly stated that God cannot be charged with partiality *(vaiṣamya)* and cruelty *(nairghṛṇya)*[10], since *karma* alone is responsible for the prevailing inequality in creation. In his *SRJS* (II.42) Parāśara makes this quite evident. God creates the world as it is, full of inequality, only in accordance with the *karma* of the individuals concerned. The *Śruti*-s also are in support of this, says Parāśara.[11]

Another interesting point explained by Parāśara is

bodies, still it is only the former that experiences the fruits of his own action, but not the latter. Īśvara is not a *bhoktā* (the experient) of *karma.* He is the *bhojayitā* (one who makes others experience their *karma*). Explaining the name *pūtātmā* (name no.10) Parāśara in his VSB raises an interesting question as to how *karma* does not affect Īśvara but only the *jīva* because both of them have bodies and those who have bodies do perform *karma.* Parāśara himself answers the question by saying that the apparent association of *karma* with Īśvara cannot produce any effect on Him. The analogy given is that of one who whips another person with a lash. Though the contact with the whip is common to both the punisher and the punished, still it is only the punished person who suffers but not the person who is wielding the whip. The *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* passage *anaśnannanyaḥ* (3.1.1) and the *Gītā*-text,[6] *'na māṃ karmāṇi limpanti...'* (4.14), as also the *Brahmasūtra, saṁbhogaprāptiriti cet na.,* etc., (1.2.8) are quoted in support.

DHARMABHŪTAJÑĀNA

Another important theory of this school is that *jñāna,* also known as *saṁvit, dhī, buddhi,* etc., is an essential and inseparable attribute of the soul which characterises it in all the states of wakefulness, dream and deep sleep. This is technically known as *dharmabhūtajñāna* (attributive knowledge) which can expand and contract. Although we do not have a direct reference to this essential feature of the soul, fragment 29 of the *Tattvaratnākara* proves the same point. According to this, knowledge is self-manifest and is solely dependent upon the soul. The soul and its knowledge are both self-effulgent like the sun and his brilliance. Parāśara quotes the *Gītā*-verse,

yathā prakāśayatyekaḥ (13.34) and a number of Upaniṣadic passages declaring the self to be self-luminous, the self itself being of the nature of knowledge. We have another reference to this concept in Parāśara's *VSB* under the name *muktānāṁ paramā gatiḥ* (no.13). Parāśara states that *jñāna,* etc., are natural to the self and this is not negated even in the state of *mokṣa.*[12]

THE ŚEṢA-ŚEṢI-BHĀVA

One of the cardinal tenets of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school is that the relation between the universe consisting of *cit* and *acit* and the Lord is the one that subsists between a part and the whole, or between a subsidiary and the principal entity that is subserved by it, or between the body and the soul. The definition of body given by Rāmānuja in his *Śrībhāṣya* and the *Vedārthasaṅgraha* is worth noticing in this context. According to it, body is that which in its entirety depends upon, is controlled by and subserves another entity and thus forms its inseparable mode. This inseperable connection always exists between the supporter and the supported, the controller and the controlled and the principal entity and the subsidiary entity.[13] The *antaryāmibrāhmaṇa* of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* is in full support of this view.[14] We have several references to this concept in the words of Parāśara who is a close follower of Rāmānuja. In the *SRJS* (II.23-24) he points out that the entire universe *(aśeṣaḥ prapañcaḥ)* forms the subsidiary *(śeṣaḥ)* and thus the body *(vapuḥ)* of the Lord who forms its soul *(ātman)* on several grounds such as the creation *(utpatti),* maintenance *(sthiti),* activity *(pravṛtti)* and dissolution *(grasana)* of the universe and also by virtue of His controlling *(niyamana)* and pervading over them *(vyāpana).* According to Parāśara the *abheda*-texts speak

of the non-difference between the Supreme and the rest of creation through the principle of co-ordinate predication *(sāmānādhikaraṇya)* only because of this kind of relation between the Lord and the universe. The *SGRK* (śl. 22) also explains this principle of the *śeṣa-śeṣi-bhāva* between the divine couple and the rest of the creation. Parāśara's explanation of the names *bhūtakṛt* (name No. 5), *bhūtabhṛt* (name No. 6), *bhāva* (name No. 7.), *bhūtātmā* (name no.8) and *bhūtabhāvana* (name no.9) in the VSB also bring out this important concept in a clear manner. According to him all these five names clearly explain the *śeṣitva* of the Lord.

Creation of the beings, their maintenance and the manifestation in His sportive form are all indicative of the principal character of the Lord. Of special importance is the name *bhūtātmā* which spells out the *śarīrātmabhāva.* The relation between the Lord and the universe which is known as *dehātmabhāva* is different from the relationship entities like wife, house, lands, etc., have with a person on whom they depend for their support. The relation that the world has with Īśvara is more internal *(antaraṅga)* than external. The word *bhūta-bhāvanaḥ* which means 'one who nourishes the beings by being their support and benefactor' is also indicative of the *śeṣatva* of the entire universe. The name *muktānāṁ paramāgatiḥ* (name no. 12) also according to Parāśara, shows the *śeṣa-śeṣin* relation that exists between even the liberated beings and the Lord *(mukta-tat-prāpyayoḥ śeṣa-śeṣi-bhāvaḥ).*

Parāśara's *Aṣṭaślokī* also makes clear the idea of the *śeṣa-śeṣin* relation between the world and Lord Viṣṇu. While explaining the term - Nārāyaṇa as 'one who is the abode or ultimate goal of all living beings', he says

that the *jīva* is always subservient to Lord Nārāyaṇa who is also expressed by the letter 'a' constituting the sacred syllable 'Om'. The *jīva* exists only for the sake of the Lord but never for his own sake (śl. 3).

THE NATURE AND MEANS OF RELEASE (MOKṢA)

In the state of release, the soul is totally subservient *(śeṣa)* to the Lord. This *śeṣatva* is as natural as *jñāna* (knowledge) is to the soul.[15] By this Parāśara differ from others who says that the state of *mokṣa* is marked by total independence, that is, it is devoid of the feelings of bliss, etc.

While the role of *bhakti* as a means of release is unquestioned, the place of *prapatti* (also known as *śaraṇāgati* or *bharanyāsa*) was not specifically described at least in the canonical works of Rāmānuja like the *Śrībhāṣya* and the *Gītābhāṣya.* Scholars have explained this aspect of Rāmānuja's treatment as based upon the fact that the rival schools to whom Rāmānuja was addressing his works do not accept *prapatti* as a separate means of *mokṣa.* In fact Rāmānuja had a great heritage and a tradition behind him in this regard.[16] Parāśara, however, makes the position very clear regarding *prapatti* as a means of *mokṣa.* In his *SRJS* (I.17) he states that 'Viṣṇumāyā' can be crossed only when *prapatti* is done to the Lord.[17] In the *SRJS* (II.87-89) we have a detailed statement about *prapatti.* Parāśara says that several *Upaniṣad*-s declare the Lord to be the supreme controller and master of *cit* and *acit.* He is both the means and goal of human endeavour *(upāya* and *upeya).* To be so is His nature but not His quality. That is why "'O Lord! I resort to you, who are my refuge *(śaraṇa)*' says Parāśara. In verse 89 the declaration of *Śaraṇāgati*

knowledge or action or devotion; nor is he aware of anything like *icchā* (desire), the proper eligibility *(adhikāra),* the feasibility of such a hope, etc. 'Full of sin and foolishness and with a confused state of mind, I request you to be my saviour', says Parāśara.

jñānakriyābhajanasampadakiñcano'ham-
icchādhikāraśakanānuśayānabhijñaḥ
raṅgeśa! pūrṇavṛjinaśśaraṇam bhaveti
maurkhyād bravīmi manasā viṣayākulena
(*SRJS.* II.89)

In verse 102 of the second century of the SRJS, Parāśara makes this declaration still clear. "I have been made your burden and responsibility *(bhara)* by my teachers. I have also orally declared that I seek refuge. Therefore, it behoves you to accept me as your entrusted burden."

tava bharo'hamakāriṣi dhārmikaiś-
śaraṇamityapi vācamudairiram
iti sasākṣikayannidamadya māṁ
kuru bharaṁ tava raṅgadhurandhara (II.102)

In his VSB, explaining the word *'saṁnyāsakṛt'* (name no.587) ('one who cuts *rajas* and *tamas* through *saṁnyāsa'*) Parāśara interprets the word *saṁnyāsa* thus: *'bhartari bharanyāsaḥ saṁnyāsaḥ'* ('depositing one's burden with the Lord is *saṁnyāsa'*). This is same as *prapatti.* He again states *sā hi bhavacikitsā* ('that *prapatti* indeed is the remedy for transmigration').

In his *Aṣṭaślokī* (śl. 6-8) Parāśara clarifies this concept of *Prapatti.* In verse 6 Parāśara makes *Prapatti* to Lakṣmī first, before resorting to the Lord, She being the means for that end. In verse 7 he explains the meaning of *Caramaśloka* (*Gītā,* 18.66) which is in the form of the Lord's assurance of protection to one who surrenders

to Him whole-heartedly. The last verse may be said to be the statement of *prapatti* by Parāśara where he expresses his inability to implement the *karma, jñāna* and *bhakti-yoga*-s as means of salvation. Even regarding *prapatti* he is unable to follow it because of his utter helplessness and lack of firm conviction of its implementation. Still the hope of being saved by the Lord, He being the final means, sustains him.

GRADATION AMONG THE RELEASED SOULS

In his explanation of the name *muktānāṁ paramā gatiḥ* (name no.12) in the *VSB*, Parāśara points out that the word *muktānāṁ* ('of the released souls') exhibited in the plural number makes two things clear: (i) that the released souls are different from one another; and (2) that they are many in number. They are also different from the Lord because of the difference implied by the term *gati* ('the goal'). Parāśara also quotes an upaniṣadic passage *pṛthagātmānaṁ preritāraṁ ca matvā* (*Śvetāśvatara, Upaniṣad* 1.6) and the *Brahmasūtra muktopasṛpyavya padeśācca* (i. ii. iii) in support.

ĪŚVARA AN ABODE OF PERFECTIONS

In keeping with the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition, Parāśara believes in the Supremacy of Lord Nārāyaṇa, also known as Viṣṇu, Vāsudeva, etc., who is the infinite abode of innumerable perfections such as knowledge, lordship and strength which are collectively known as the 'six perfections' *(ṣāḍguṇya)*.[18] He is also at the same time devoid of any blemishes. This is what is known as the *ubhayaliṅgatva* of the Lord. This has been clearly stated by Parāśara in the *VSB* while refuting the *prima facie* view that the Supreme Brahman is devoid of any positive

illround knowledge which is natural to Him without any imitations of time and space (SRJS.II.29). His parental care is quite remarkable. To alleviate the sufferings of a sick child sometimes the mother takes the medicine. n the same way, the Lord also comes down into the vorld of mortals and undergoes all sufferings for the ;ake of the beings. The Lord's friendliness is also quite ippealing. Though He punishes the wicked it is only lue to His genuine love for them that He does so. It s like a friend arresting with chains, etc., a mad person est he should run out of the house and injure himself by falling into some ditch. Such an act cannot be construed is cruel, says Parāśara.

In the *SRJS* (I.9.116; II.38.51) and *VSB* (name no.122) Parāśara enters into a very detailed discussion on the question of Lord Viṣṇu's supremacy over the rest of he divinity. The very fact that the Lord is the eternal consort and abode of Lakṣmī, the mother of the universe nd His royal insignia such as the crown and five weapons, ll bear ample evidence to this point. Parāśara also alludes o Purāṇic episodes mentioning Brahmā as born out of ne lotus that has sprung out of His navel and that Śiva vas the off-spring of Brahmā, in order to justify the upremacy of Viṣṇu over these important gods. Another nportant characteristic of Viṣṇu's Supremacy *(paratva-piśuna)* is that He is the promoter of the quality f *sattva* which is necessary for effecting the salvation f the suffering humanity, and also His boundless concern nd compassion for them which is responsible for His *avatāra*-manifestations.

As for the *vibhūti*-s (glories) of the Lord they consist f the *nitya* (the eternal) as manifested in the *Vaikuṇṭha* nd the *līlā* which comprises the rest of the creation. Commenting on the word *durādharṣa* (*VSB* name no.82)

Parāśara takes occasion to describe the *Nityavibhūti* that is, *Vaikuṇṭha* where the Lord is attended upon by His consort Śrī and Bhūmi, and served by many eternally liberated souls such as Ananta, Garuḍa and Viṣvaksena. Parāśara also mentions that this description is in accordance with the statement found in the *Kauṣītakī* and other *Upaniṣad*-s.

THE PĀÑCARĀTRA (SĀTTVATA) RELIGION

We have quite a number of references to this religion which is also known as the *Bhāgavata* system. This is one of the two main divisions of the Śrīvaiṣṇava religious texts, the other being the *Vaikhānasa.* Explaining the name *sāttvatāṁ patiḥ* (no.514) in the *VSB,* Parāśara states that the word *sāttvata* is the *śāstra* (scripture) or the work *(karman)* or *sattvān.* Also under the name *'jñānamuttamam'* (no.455) Parāśara interprets it to mean the *Pāñcarātra* through which all other knowledge including the duties of a Śrīvaiṣṇava can be obtained. One of the important characteristics of the *Pāñcarātra* religion is its *Vyūha*-theory. The Supreme Being has five aspects, namely, *Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Arcā* and *Antaryāmin.* The *Para* form is also known as Vāsudeva. The *Vyūha*-aspect is four-fold *(caturvyūha)* as *Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna* and *Aniruddha.* Explaining the names *'Caturātmā'* and *'Caturvyūhaḥ'* (nos.139-140) in the *VSB,* Parāśara mentions the four *Vyūha*-s and answers the question as to how one and the same God can also be four-fold. The Lord, though one, manifests Himself as these four deities for carrying out different cosmic functions, arranging and distributing those functions among these forms for the benefit of the devotees. Each of these four *vyūha*-s again has its own configuration, colour,

II.39-40) Parāśara makes a detailed statement about the nature and function of the *vyūha*-s.[19] The six qualities, in their totality make up the body of Vāsudeva, which is within the reach of the *mukta*-s *(muktabhogya).* *Saṁkarṣaṇa* in whom the qualities of *jñāna* and *bala* are predominant, is responsible for the destruction of the universe. The *Pradyumna-vyūha* connected with *aiśvarya* and *vīrya* carries out the teaching of religion. *Aniruddha* connected with *śakti* and *tejas* protects the world and confers the knowledge of truth. Parāśara states that these four forms are meant for the contemplation of different aspirants and that they correspond to the four states of wakefulness *(jāgrat),* dreaming *(svapna),* deep sleep *(atyalasa,* that is, *suṣupti)* and the final stage *(mūrcchā)* respectively.

It is also clear from a verse of the *SRJS* (II.37) that there is a subtle difference between the *Para* Vāsudeva and *Vyūha* Vāsudeva. The Para Vāsudeva who is known as *nityodita* being the object of experience of the *mukta*-s, is the source of the three subsequent *Vyūha*-s.

THE CONCEPT OF AVATĀRA-S

The *Avatāra-s* come under the *vibhava* category of the *Vyūha*-s. In the *SRJS* (I.124; II.48 ff) and in the *VSB,* Parāśara refers to the *avatāra*-s of Lord Viṣṇu. Time and again the author points out that the Lord though without a birth, manifests Himself among gods, men and animals, sharing their qualities with a view to save them from the endless cycle of birth and death. In all His incarnations Lakṣmī also takes part making His activities more interesting and fruitful. Only the wise can understand the Lord's greatness in all His manifestations. The ordinary and ignorant ones, however, unable to decipher the purposes of the Lord's actions, find fault with Him.

ARCĀ (ICONIC FORM)

This aspect of the Lord's *vyūha* is also referred to by Parāśara in the *VSB* (under the name *arcita* and *kumbha* no.640-641) and also in his *SRJS* (II.74-75). The word *arcita* is explained as 'one who has assumed the *arcāvatāra*'. Explaining the salient features of this form, Parāśara states that it is not beyond the reach of men like the *para*-form; nor is it limited to a particular time or place like the *vibhava*-s. It is always visible to our eyes at all holy places and temples and even in our own homes. Its innermost secrecy should be ascertained through the *Pāñcarātra*-texts and *Smṛti*-s and *Purāṇa*-s. Quoting from a *Pāñcarātra*-text Parāśara states that one who prepares a pleasant idol of Lord Viṣṇu with silver, gold etc., and worships it after proper installation, will have all his sins removed. He attains Brahman having that very form which he worshipped on earth. In His *arcā*-form the Lord is totally dependent on the *arcaka* (priest) and bears with all the inconveniences, and pleases His worshippers by His magnanimity and easy accessibility.

THE CONCEPT OF ŚRĪ

Lakṣmī or Śrī, the eternal consort of Viṣṇu is not only the source of all prosperity but also a bestower of the power of poesy. Reference is made to the *ṣāḍguṇya* in connection with Lakṣmī also. Since She is the co-performer of the Lord's duties *(sahadharmacāriṇī)*, Parāśara speaks of Her role in the cosmic activity, namely creation, sustenance and destruction also. Since everything is common between Her and the Lord, She is also said to wield the five weapons. She accompanies Him in all His *avatāra*-s.[24] The Lord does everything to please Her

and sport.[25] A detailed statement of the nature of Śrī as the *śakti* of the Lord is given by Parāśara in his explanation of the name 'Mādhava'. She is said to be one with the Lord and different from Him, like the moon and her effulgence. All other powers are derived from Lakṣmī including the *prāṇaśakti* animating the entire creation. Lakṣmī alone acts however everything She does is however the expression of the Lord's wish.

Another important aspect of Lakṣmī which is a characteristic of the Śrīvaiṣṇava school is Her role as the Mother of the beings and as mediator *(puruṣakāra)* between the man and the Lord. In SGRK, Parāśara draws a beautiful pen-picture of Mother Lakṣmī making an impassionate appeal on behalf of the erring humanity to the Lord to forgive the faults of their children because nobody is free from shortcomings *('nirdoṣaḥ ka iha jagati')*. She thus establishes a rapport between man and God *('svajanayasi')*. That is why She is the Mother of all *('mātā tadasi naḥ')*.

Another important concept explained by Parāśara in his *Aṣṭaślokī* (śl. 6) as also in the *stotra*-s is that one has to first surrender to Śrī before resorting to the Lord. This is in accordance with the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition maintained by *ācārya*-s like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja who preceded Parāśara.

THE NIRVĀHA-S (INGENIOUS INTERPRETATIONS) ATTRIBUTED TO PARĀŚARA

In the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition Parāśara's *nirvāha-s* on several words, expressions and passages of the *Divyaprabandha* are quite popular and are treated on a par with those of earlier *ācārya*-s like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja. The nature of Parāśara's interpretation is to be understood as deep-rooted in his religious experiences and philosophical background of the school which he

in the form of witty anecdotes, repartees and delectable flashbacks fo several epic and purāṇic episodes. These are to be appreciated and admired sometimes from the religious view-point and sometimes from the literary view-point. At best one may describe Parāśara's method of interpretation as *camatkārāvaha.* They are even today read over and appreciated in the traditional *kālakṣepa*-s. No serious philosophical study can be made on these *nirvāha*-s. Thus for instance explaining the passage *nāl vēdam kaṇḍānē,* ('one who has 'seen' the four Veda-s', 'one who has been seen by the four *Veda-s*'), Parāśara takes the word *'kaṇḍān'* and interprets it as *Kāṇappaṭṭavan* ('one who has been seen') although it can also mean *kaṇḍavan* ('one who has seen').

Explaining the relationship between Īśvara and *jīva* Parāśara calls it the *rakṣya-rakṣaka-bhāva* ('the relation between the Saviour and the saved'), Parāśara narrates an interesting anecdote explaining this point which may be taken as representing the general style of Parāśara's *nirvāha*-s. A merchant went abroad leaving his pregnant wife at home and he did not come for several years. In the meantime his wife delivered a son who grew up to be a merchant like his own father. He also left on a business tour. It so happened that both the father and son with their belongings took shelter at a place which was too narrow to accommodate both. When each one of them was trying to push out the other, a third person who knew their relationship happened to come there. When he told them about it, both the father and son became one and their merchandise became one. The father became the unquestioned protector of the son and his things. This is exactly the kind of relation that subsists between *jīva* and *Īśvara.* What is needed, stresses Parāśara, is the mere knowledge of being related with the Lord

(sambandhajñāna). When this is present, everything else is taken care of.

One more important point stressed by the *nirvāha*-s is the importance of doing *śaraṇāgati* to Śrī even before doing it with reference to Lord. 'Śrī-prapatti' precedes 'Nārāyaṇa-prapatti'. In Her dual capacity as the mother of *jīva* and the consort of the Lord, Śrī can take the errant son on Her side and see that the Lord forgives his faults. In other words She acts as the mediator between *jīva* and *Īśvara.*

Having thus analysed the important philosophical statements spread over the writings of Parāśara now it remains to assess his contribution to the Viśiṣṭādvaita. To this is the following chapter devoted.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION: AN ASSESSMENT OF PARĀŚARA'S CONTRIBUTION

Thus on an overall review of Parāśara's works one is convinced of the wide range of his scholarship in Tamil and Sanskrit and also of the popularity and unquestioned authority with which he strode the field of Śrīvaiṣṇava religion and philosophy like a giant in the post-Rāmānuja period, preceding Vedānta Deśika. He was an all-rounder—a poet, commentator, dramatist,[1] philosopher, religionist and an outstanding dialectician. The immense popularity he enjoyed among his contemporaries can be vouchsafed by the statement made by Nārāyaṇa, who commented on Parāśara's *Śrīguṇaratnakośa.* It points out that Parāśara had the rare privilege of being carried by the Brāḥmaṇa-s as a token of their admiration and appreciation of his exposition of the *Kaiśikapurāṇa.*[B2] The title *'bhaṭṭa'* with which his name is associated speaks very high of his scholastic attainments. On Parāśara's own statement, this name was given to him by Lord Raṅganātha Himself.[3] He is also traditionally known as the foster-child of Lord Raṅganātha and His consort[4] and according to other accounts he was the *purohita* of Lord Raṅganātha.[5] His popularity in his own community can also be understood by another fact that he was a superb interpreter and exponent of the *Nālāyiradivya-prabandha.* The *'Bhaṭṭar nirvāha-s'* which are famous among the Śrīvaiṣṇava traditionists support this claim. In one of the verses of the

that assuming the role of a *Deśika* (teacher), he was cheating the world at large as though he was a great *jñānin* solely devoted to the Lord. Excluding references stemming from his humility, one can conclude that Parāśara was certainly a *deśika* of great religious and philosophical standing of his times. It may also be noted that Parāśara was a pragmatic man who had independent and frank views in the conduct of the day-to-day ritual connected with the temple. As recorded in tradition, Parāśara once resented the trivial excuses on which the priests of the Śrīraṅgam temple wanted to perform an elaborate purificatory ceremony. One of the traditional views is that Parāśara was a great exponent of the school recognised and authorised by Rāmānuja himself to carry on his work. That his life, activities and compositions became an integral part of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition is clear from the recitation of the *stotra*-s and the *Tirumañjanakkavi*-s even today in the temple worship.

An in-depth study of all the available compositions of Parāśara reveals that he was an original thinker who has made very rich contributions to the growth and development of the Śrīvaiṣṇava religious thought. He was in the order of great writers of the school like Nāthamuni and Yāmuna. Like the *Nyāyatattva* of Nāthamuni (which is lost to posterity but for a few fragments) and the *Siddhitraya* of Yāmuna, Parāśara also composed the monumental treatise the *Tattvaratnākara* ('an ocean of *tattva*-s').

The fragments which are collected and studied in the present book provide a wealth of information of his views regarding several topics in the fields of *Nyāya* and *Mīmāṁsā*. Although a complete picture of his opinion on several of these topics could not be formed, it is still evident that he represented a very bold and independent thinking on several issues. For instance he

opines that Kāśakṛtsna composed the *devatākāṇḍa* comprising four *adhyāya*-s which along with the twelve chapters of Jaimini's *Pūrvamīmāṁsā* forms the *'Ṣoḍaśalakṣaṇī'*, which again has its sequel in Bādarāyaṇa's *Brahmasūtra.* Quoting his opinion Vedānta Deśika in his *Adhikaraṇasārāvali* politely remarks that he is not competent to question the veracity of that statement.[7]

Parāśara is also emphatic that there can be no restriction on the components of a syllogistic statement. Also significant is his observation that *Vyāpti* between *hetu* and *sādhya* need not be attributed to repeated observation. It can be grasped even by a single observation. What is more significant is perhaps the statement that there need be no rigid order of *pratijñā, hetu,* etc., His opinion that the *Kevalavyatirekin* type of *anumāna* cannot be accepted as valid is also in tune with the opinion of Yāmuna and Rāmānuja. However in another passage of the *Tattvaratnākara* he seems to accept it which Vedānta Deśika the great conformist, tries to explain away as representing the *prima facie* view. Parāāara's views on *tarka* are quite bold and emphatic. *Tarka* (indirect argument) can never claim an independent status in the scheme of *pramāṇa*-s, according to him. His views on *saṁśaya* (doubt) and *Smṛti* are traditional. It may be pointed out that Parāśara conforms to the traditional views of the school on almost all the issues coming under the category of *pramāṇa*-s, although some notice a few non-conforming views on issues like *arthāpatti.* In one place *arthāpatti* is not accepted as a separate *pramāṇa* whereas in another place it is treated as an independent *prāmaṇa.* Again, as Vedānta Deśika points out, it is difficult to frame any opinion on Parāśara's views in view of the fragmentary nature of the *Tattvaratnākara.* It is a pity that this text was not available in full

As noted earlier, the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, as it came to be known at a later date,[8] owes its development and popularity to several *ācārya*-s whose contributions were on the two planes of philosophy and religion. Parāśara's contribution was also immense from these aspects. On the philosophical side his *Tattvaratnākara* undoubtedly occupies a unique position. On the religious side his *Aṣṭaślokī, Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya,* his interpretation of the *Tiruneḍuntāṇṭaka* passage and the *nirvāha*-s point to his multifaceted genius. It may be stated that the interpretation of the *praṇava,* the *mūlamantra,* the *dvayamantra* and the *caramaśloka* contained in the *Aṣṭaślokī* formed the basis for Vedānta Deśika's magnificent composition, the *Rahasyatrayasāra* in the *maṇipravāla*-style. Parāśara's interpretation of the *Viṣṇusahasranāmastotra* provided a refreshing outlook of the real import of the *stotra* differing basically from Śaṅkara's commentary. According to Parāśara the very fact that a repetition of sacred names of Lord Viṣṇu is itself capable of conferring the highest bliss on the reciter goes a long way to prove that Brahman is *saguṇa.* A *stotra* would have no meaning if it does not carry conviction with the devotees, by failing to deliver the highest good.[9]

Parāśara's beautiful *stotra*-s and the *Tirumañjanakkavi*-s not only present him as a great poet but also as an ardent devotee of Lord Śrīraṅganātha. Like Yāmuna who first composed the *Catuśślokī* in praise of Śrī and followed it up by his *Stotraratna,* Parāśara also composed the *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* in praise of Goddess Raṅganāyakī, and the *Śrīraṅgarājastava* on Lord Raṅganātha Himself. Rāmānuja also in his *Śaraṇāgatigadya* eulogises the Goddess first and then the Lord. Parāśara's illustrious father Śrīvatsāṅka also

followed the same tradition in composing the *Pañcastav*
of which the *Śrīstava* is one.

THE INFLUENCE OF EARLIER WRITERS ON PARĀŚARA

Parāśara's *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* and the *Śrīraṅgarājastava* contain ideas and expressions which are similar with those of his predecessors Yāmuna, Rāmānuja and Kūreśa, his own father. That the compositions of the Āḻvārs provided the very basic inspiration and content for his religious philosophy goes without saying. The *Catuśślokī* of Yāmuna formed the standard expression on the concept of Śrī which was followed by later writers of this school like Rāmānuja, Kūreśa and Parāśara. In this hymn Śrī has been conceived of as the inseparable consort of Lord Viṣṇu, the mother of the beings, the mistress of the two *Vibhūti-s (nitya* and *līlā)* and the mediator between man and God. The doctrine of *prapatti* to Śrī is also found in this *stotra* of Yāmuna. The introductory portion of Rāmānuja's *Śaraṇāgatigadya* where again *śaraṇāgati* to Śrī is clearly articulated, follows Yāmuna's *stotra.* Thus Parāśara also expresses his *Śaraṇāgati* to Śrī in his *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* (śl. 59).

Rāmānuja's influence on Parāśara can also be seen in several passages of the *Tattvaratnākāra* and the *Śrīraṅgarājastava.*[10] Parāśara refers to the opinion of Rāmānuja and Yāmuna (obviously referring to the *Pāñcarātrādhikaraṇa* of the *Śrībhāṣya* and the *Āgamaprāmāṇya* of Yāmuna) that the *Pāñcarātra*-scriptures are the compositions of the Lord Himself and as such they cannot be treated as alternative to the *Śruti*-texts (which are recapitulated and instructed to

Brahmā).[11] In the *Śrīraṅgarājastava* (II.22) Parāśara incorporates the view of Rāmānuja expressed in his *Śrībhāṣya* under *tattu samanvayāt* (I.i.4). Refuting the Mīmāṁsāka's view that *Upaniṣad*-s which speak of the Supreme Brahman, an already existing entity *(siddhārtha)* are secondary in import since they do not enjoin something to be done *(kārya),* Rāmānuja and following him, Parāśara maintain that even sentences speaking of accomplished entities are valid in their own right, as in the sentence uttered by a reliable person, thus: *atra āste nidhiḥ* ('Here is a treasure').[12] Such passages are not different from the *vidhi*-s ordaining *upāsanā* or *phala.* Thus they become relevant and connected with the human end *(puruṣārtha).*[13]

Another great teacher who influenced Parāśara was his own father Kūreśa. Innumerable are the instances which can be cited in support. In the first place Parāśara pays homage to his father in the very opening verse of the *Śrīraṅgarājastava.*[14] The *Śrīstava* of his father gave him the necessary impetus and background to compose the *Śrīguṇaratnakośa.* That creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe is a sport of the divine couple is clearly found in the *Śrīstava* and faithfully followed and developed in the *Śrīguṇaratnakośa.*[15] Parāśara, like his father, prays to Goddess Lakṣmī to bless him with the power of speech.[16] Expressions like *aiśvaryam mahadeva*[17] and *Śrīraṅgarājamahiṣī*[18] are found in the *Śrīstava*[19] also. Likewise verses 29 and 56 of Kūreśa's *Varadarājastava* have their echo in *Śrīraṅgarājastava.*[20]

As instances of the influence of the Āḻvārs on Parāśara the following may be cited. The idea that one cannot adequately praise the Lord regarding whom the *Śruti* itself declares *yasyāmatam tasya matam.,* etc[21]., is found in the *Śrīraṅgarājastava.*[22] In a way this is reminiscent

of Nammāḻvār's *Periyatiruvantādi* passage[23] *'pugazhvōı pazhippōm pugazhōm pazhiyōm'. A passage from th Tiruvāymozhi*[24] *'Muḍiccōdiyāy...'* etc., likewise, form the model for the *Śrīraṅgarājastava* verse[25] whicl describes the effulgence of the Lord's gem-studded crowı as the brilliance of the moon-like face which, like ɛ stream began to gush in the upward direction.

The *Perumāḷtirumozhi*[26] of Kulaśekhara Āḻvār refers to the two pillars adjacent to the *sanctum-sanctorun* in the Śrīraṅgam temple as *maṇattūṇ* ('the fragrant pillars'). They are held for support by those who come close to the Lord and gaze at His charm, which like a flood is sure to submerge or wash away anything that come near. The same idea is not only expressed by Parāśara in *SRJS*,[27] but the word *'maṇattūṇ'* has been rendered as *'āmodastambha'*.[28] What Periyāḻvār described in a decad of verses beginning with *nāvalam periya tīvinil vāzhum.,* etc., depicting the ravishing influence of the sweetness music of Lord Kṛṣṇa's flute has been summarized in a single verse by Parāśara in *SRJS*[29] *'śailo'gniśca jalāmbabhūva...'* etc.

?ARĀSARA'S INFLUENCE ON THE LATER WRITERS

The great position occupied by Parāśara in the ;rīvaiṣṇava tradition and the depth of his scholarship :xerted a profund influence on later writers also, of whom /edānta Deśika deserves special mention. As already ıoticed, the credit of providing some insight into the ›therwise lost text of the *Tattvaratnākara* goes to Vedānta)eśika. In all these references we find that Parāśara is ıentioned by epithets expressive of utmost reverence s *Bhaṭṭaparāśarapādaiḥ, abhiyuktaiḥ,* etc. The entire iscussion on the section on *anumāna* of the *Iyāyapariśuddhi* is replete with references to Parāśara's

views. It is true that Vedānta Deśika also refers to some of Parāśara's views which seem to go against the traditional concepts. Even then Vedānta Deśika makes a very polite reference and never contradicts or criticises his views. The influence of the *Aṣṭaślokī* the first independent treatise on the *Rahasyatraya* of this school, on the *Rahasyatrayasāra* of Vedānta Deśika has already been pointed out. The reference made by Parāśara *(SRJS)* of the *pañcaheti* or *pañcāyudha*-ornament put on Lord Kṛṣṇa by his mother Yaśoda as a talisman is found in Vedānta Deśika's *Yādavābhyudaya.*[30] What Parāśara states in *SRJS*[31] describing the *śāntodita*-state of Vyūha-Vāsudeva is found in Vedānta Deśika's *Varadarājapañcāśat*[32] also.

The popularity enjoyed by Parāśara's works in the commentarial tradition may also be construed as an indirect indication of his influence on later writers. Thus his *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* received as many as seven commentaries. His *Aṣṭaślokī* was commented upon by more than twelve scholars.[33] His *Śrīraṅgarājastava* has at least four commentaries.[34]

Thus on the strength of the long tradition of the Śrīvaiṣṇava religion and philosophy which holds Parāśara Bhaṭṭa in great esteem and on the basis of his monumental work, the *Tattvaratnākara* and the *stotra*-s which form a class by themselves, one can safely conclude that Parāśara played a very dominant role in the development of the basic concepts of the school. Notwithstanding the loss of his colossal work the *Tattvaratnākara,* one can still see the range of his thinking, embracing in its fold the salient features of the Nyāya and Mīmāṁsā-śāstra-s which were, in all probability, reviewed in the light of the Śrīvaiṣṇava philosophy. His contribution to the building up of the school is immense and it may be said that writers like Vedānta Deśika continued on the lines shown by him and laid it on a firm foundation.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. See *Nyāyasiddhāñjana* (N.S.), pp. 2-3 aśeṣacidacitprakāraṁ brahmaikameva tattvam, tatra prakāraprakāriṇoḥ prakārāṇāṁ ca mitho' tyantabhede'pi viśiṣṭaikyādivivakṣayaikatvavyapadeśas-taditaraniṣedhaśca.

2. See *Perspectives of Theism, and Absolutism in Indian philosophy* "The Viśiṣṭādvaita Philosophy," by Dr M. Narasimhachary, pp. 8-9; and *God and the Universe in the Vedāntic Theology of Rāmānuja* by Eric J. Lott, p.1.

3. See Dr S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy,* Vol. II, p.659. Also see, "Viśiṣṭādvaita - Its Mystical and Metaphysical Undertones", *The Indian Philosophy Congress Endowment Lectures,* p. 25 by Prof. K. Seshadri.

4. See the *Śrībhāṣya,* opening part, verse 2; line 2; p.2 "saṁsārāgni- vidīpana-vyapagata- prāṇātma-sañjīvanīm."

5. See Prof. R. Ramanujachari, "Fragments from Nyāyatattva", *Prof. K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume,* pp. 555-578.

6. For a complete study of his works see *Yāmuna's Contribution to Viśiṣṭādvaita* by Dr. M. Narasimhachary.

7. See *Āgamaprāmāṇya,* Gaekwad Oriental Series, No.160.

8. *The Cultural Heritage of India* Vol. IV, pp. 179-183. Also see *'Ācārya-divya-caritra-ratnāvali'* by Sri Kavitārkikasiṁhācārya of Guptakuḍi (19th cent), śl. 101. At present this manuscript is taken up for an edition under the "Śāstracūḍāmaṇi" scheme in Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras, by Dr N.S. Satakopan.

9. For a detailed account of the story of divine intervention, see *Prapannāmṛta,* Ch.38, pp.116-117.

10. See *Divyasūricarita,* Ch. XVIII, śl. 94, p.114. Also see S.N. Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy,* Vol. III, p.109 where it is stated that Kūreśa had another son by the name Padmanetra.

11. See Introductory verse of the *Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya* of Parāśara. Cf: *Taniyan* of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa: "Śrīparāśarabhaṭṭāryaḥ śrīraṅgeśa-purohitaḥ, śrīvat- sāṅkasutaḥ śrīmān śreyase me'stu bhūyase.'

12. See the article, 'Contribution of Tamil Nadu to Sanskrit Śrīvaiṣṇavism', by Dr V. Varadachari, Proceedings of the *First International Sanskrit Conference,* Vol. I Part I, 1975, p. 442.

13. See Dr V.K.S.N. Raghavan, *History of Viśiṣṭādvaita Literature,* p.17.

14. See *History of Indian Philosophy,* Vol. III, p.135.

15. See *History of Śrīvaiṣṇavas* by T.A. Gopinatha Rao, p.51.

16. Cf: *An Indian Ephemeris* Vol. III. (A.D. 1000 to 1199).

17. See *Guruparamaparāprabhāva,* p.589.

8. Cf: *An Indian Ephemeris* Vol. III.p.231.

9. See *Guruparamparāprabhāva,* p.360.

.0. *ibid.* pp. 236-241.

.1. *A History of South India* by K.A. Nilakantha Sastri, p.430.

.2. See *The Hoysala Vaṁśa* by William Coelho, p.70; pp.281-282.

3. See *Śrībhāṣya,* p.4.

4. See *Guruparamparāprabhāva,* pp. 234-236.

5. See S.N. Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy,* Vol. III. p.109; Also cf. The chart given at the beginning of the *Guruparamparāprabhāva.*

6. See *Guruparamparāprabhāva,* pp. 349-350.

CHAPTER II

1. See *Kaiśikapurāṇa,* Pub: Śrīvaiṣṇava Grantha Pracāraṇasamiti, Trichy, 1973.

2. Ed. P.B. Annangaracharya Svāmin, Conjeevaram, 1970.

3. See *RTS,* Part II. pp.140, 161-162, 234.

4. *Āhnika-grantha,* p.1

5. A critical study of this work formed the subject for M. Phil. Degree of the present author and was submitted to the University of Madras in 1980.

6. See Sri P.B. Annangaracharya Swami, *'Nityānusandheya- stotramālā',* p.7.

8. See Yāmuna's *Āgamaprāmāṇya,* p.124 where he quotes the following from some unidentified *Pāñcarātra* text. 'cakravartyupacāreṇa bhagavantam samarcayet'.

9. For instance his *Stotraratna,* verses, 11, 12 ff.

10. See Dr G. Oberhammer, Parāśarabhaṭṭa's *Tattvaratnākara,* p. 17.
Vide *Nyāyasiddhāñjana,* p. 143.

11. Dr G. Oberhammer, Parāśara Bhaṭṭa's *Tattvaratnākara,*p. 17.

12. *Śrībhāṣya,* II.i.9. p.12.
Also Cf: *Vedārthasaṅgraha,*
'sarvātmanā ādheyatayā niyāmyatayā śeṣatayā ca apṛthaksiddhaṁ prakārabhūtamiti ākāraḥ śarīram'.. etc. p. 76

13. See *NS.* pp. 196-197 for the following quotations: "cetanācetanayoraviśiṣṭham tam prati śarīratvam; svecchayā niyacchatā bhagavatā vyāpyatvāviśeṣāt; idameva bhautikasya śarīrasyāpi śarīratvam."

14. *ibid.* p.349.
"anyeṣvaiśvaryākṣarabhogeṣvanapekṣayā jugupsayā sādhiṣṭhānam."

15. See A. Srinivasa Raghavan's *Introduction to Śrīsūktabhāṣya,* p. xxxv.

16. *RTS* (Part II), p. 20 and 379.

17. Vide *Sillarai-rahasyaṅgal,* Part II, p.68.

18. *Tiruvāymoḷi,* 5-7-10.

19. Bh.G. XVIII. 14

20. See *Gītābhāṣyatātparyacandrikā,* p. 460.

21. *ibid.*

22. *Tattvamuktākalāpa,* (TMK). Vol.I, pp.172-73.

23. ibid. Vol.I. pp.172-173.

24. ibid.

25. See Parāśara's *Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya* (VSB), Introductory pp. xviii—xxiii.

26. See *RTS,* Part II, p.121, p. 153.

27. Pub. by Śrīvaiṣṇava-granthaprakāśana-samiti, Trichy, 1973.

28. See Śrībhāṣyam Nārāyaṇa's commentary on the *Śrīguṇaratnakośa,* Introduction, p.2 (unpublished) śrīraṅganātha..kaiśikapurāṇa-śravaṇa-samudita mahimollāsita-bhāsura-raṅgaramaṇa-karuṇāsamāsādita-brahmarathavaibhavaḥ.

29. See *Tiruneḍuntāṇṭakam,* stanza 21.

30. Bh. G. XVIII, 66.

31. See Abhijñāna Śākuntala III. 21

32. See *Śṛṅgāraśataka,* 22.

CHAPTER III

1. *BG.* XVIII. 66.

2. Strictly speaking, 'ṅe'. See also *Aṣṭādhyāyī,* VII.i.13.

3. Cf *Śrīguṇaratnakośa,* verse 52.

4. See *Aṣṭaślokī,* pp. 27-28.

5. *ibid.* p.31.

6. *ibid.* p.33.

7. *ibid.* p.35.

8. *ibid.* ed. by T. Bheemacharya, p.80.

9. *Mahābhārata,* Ādiparvan I. 273.

0. See *Viṣṇusahasranāmastotra-bhāṣya,* pp. 14-15 (VSB).
Also Cf: *Kādambarī,* p. 25: "...avicchinna-paṭhyamāna-nārāyaṇanāma-sahasram..."

1. See *Sahasranāma,* śl. v.8.

2. See *Brahmasūtra,* I.iii.33-40.

3. *Viṣṇusahasranāma,* śl. 11.

4. *VSB,* p.74.

5. *ibid.* yasmiṁśca pralayam yānti.

6. *Taittirīyopaniṣad,* III.7.

7. *Yajurveda,* II.viii.7.

8. I.i.2.

9. I.iv.2.

0. *VSB.* p.74.

1. *Taittirīya Nārāyaṇa* xi, *Kaṭha, Up.*III, 9; III, 11; *Bhagavad Gītā* VII, 7 and XV, 17.

2. *VSB,* p.76.

3. See *Brahmasūtra,* I.II.25; I.III.13.

4. *Phalaśruti,* v.10.

5. *Jaimini,* VI.v.19.

6. *Chāndogya* VIII.VII.1.

7. *Brahmasūtra,* III.III.

8. See *VSB,* p.98.

29. *ibid.*, p.99.

30. *Brahmasūtra,* II.ii.42-45.

31. *VSB,* comm. on verse 28.

32. See Śaṅkara's *VSB,* p.515, "..parasmāt puruṣāt na bhinnamidam viśvam paramārthataḥ.., na tad-bhinnam kiñcit paramārthataḥ sadasti".

33. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka,* VIII.i.1.

34. *Brahmasūtra,* II.iii.29.

35. *Muṇḍaka* I.i.9.

36. Cf: *VSB,* p. 360. "tattvajñanābadhya atra-nāśye"

37. *Muṇḍaka* III.ii.9.

38. *ibid.* III.i.3.

39. *Viṣṇupurāṇa,* VI.vii.95.

40. *ibid.* II.xiv.33.

41. See *VSB,* p.124.

42. *Ślokavārtika,* under I.i.5.

43. See *VSB,* pp. 284-285.

44. *ibid.* p.247.

45. *Chāndogya* III.xiv.1.

46. Cf: hrīśca te lakṣmīśca patnyau, *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka,* III.xiii.2.

47. *Śrīguṇaratnakośa,* verse 11.

48. *ibid.* verse 12.

49. *Taittirīyasaṁhitā,* IV. iv.12.5.

51. *ibid.* verse 6.
52. *ibid.* verse 7.
53. *ibid.* verse 8.
54. *ibid.* verse 38.
55. *ibid.* verse 39.
56. *ibid.* verse 40.
57. I.vi.7.
58. *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* verse. 42, 44.
59. *ibid.* verse 46.
60. *ibid.* verse 49.
61. ibid. verse 32.
62. *ibid.* verse 33.
63. *ibid.* verse 37.
64. *ibid.* verse 50.
65. *ibid.* verse 58.
66. *ibid.* verse 56.
67. *ibid.* verse 16.
68. *ibid.* 17.
69. Cf: *ibid.* verse 18.
70. Cf: *ibid.* verse 30.
71. *Chāndogya,* VI.ii.3.
72. *Śrīguṇaratnakośa,* verse 19.
73. *Viṣṇusahasranāma,* śl. 20.
74. *Yatīndramatadīpikā,* p.10.

75. *Śrīguṇaratnakośa,* verse 47.

76. *ibid.* verse 54.

77. *ibid.* verse 51.

78. *ibid.* verse 61.

79. See P.B. Annangaracharya Svamin's commentary on *Śrīraṅganāthastotra,* pp. 7-8.

80. For a detailed account of these places, see *Śrī Vaiṣṇava Divya Deśams* compiled by L.V. Gopalan Madras, 1972.

81. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,* Ed. by James Hastings, Vol.VII. pp. 116-119.

82. See *Śrīvacanabhūṣaṇa,* p. 137.
See also *Śrīraṅgarājastava,* II.75.

83. *Śrīraṅgarājastava,* śl.I.16.

84. *Tai* Ā. I.27. 3b: 'devānām pūr ayodhyā'.

85. *ibid.* I.27.3c: 'puraṁ hiraṇmayīṁ brahmā, viveśāparājitā'.

36. Bot. Rottleria inctoria. 86a see peṅyāḻvār Tirumoḻḥi 1.6.9

36a. See Periyāḻvār Tirumzḻhi 1.6.9

37. Cf: *Śrī Veṅkateśa-prapatti* verse 8, 'Lakṣmī-mahī-tadanurūpa...'.

38. Cf: Vedānta Deśika's *Gopālaviṁśati,* 4.d. 'nāthasya nandabhavane navanīta-nāṭyam'.

9. *Chāndogya* vi.viii.7. 89a cf. peria Tirumoḻi 5.10.3-6

9a. Cf. Peria Tirumoḻi 5.10. 3-6

0. See *Bhagavad-Gītā,* XV.15, 'Vedaiśca sarvaiḥ'

91. Cf: *Pūrvamīmāṁsā:* I.ii.1. 'āmnāyasya kriyārthatvāt'.

92. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* II.iv.5.

93. *Taittirīya* II.1.1.

94. *Muṇḍaka* I.i.9.

95. *Chāndogya* VI.ii.1.

96. *ibid.* III.xiv.1.

97. *ibid.* VI.viii.7.

98. *ibid.* VI.vii.8.

99. Cf: *Vedārthasaṁgraha,* pp.16-17, 67.

100. *Mahā.* up.I.1.

101. *ibid. up.* II.3

102. See 'yo brahmāṇam', etc. (*Śvet.* VI.18) and 'brahmaṇaḥ putrāya' (*Hiraṇyakeśi-Gṛhyasūtra* I.22.14).

103. Lord Śiva is also believed to have appeared from time to time to save his devotees but those appearances are known as *svarūpa*-s but not *avatāra*-s. For details, see Ronald M. Huttington, 'Avataras and Yugas: An Essay in Purāṇic Cosmology', *Purāṇa* Vol.VI.No.1 (Jan. 1964), p.13.

104. See *Viṣṇupurāṇa,* VI.v.79: 'jñāna-śakti-balaiśvarya..'.

105. See *Sāṅkhyakārikā,* 19.

106. Cf: *Taittirīyopaniṣad,* II.8.

107. See *Bṛh. Up.,* IV.iv.5. 'sādhukārī sādhurbhavati..' and *Brahmasūtra* II.i.34. 'vaiṣamya-nairghṛṇye na..'.

107a. Periāḻvār Tirumoḻi 3.6.8

108. See *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa,* Yuddha-kāṇḍa (vi.131.90b) 'labdhvā kuladhanam rājā laṅkām prāyād vibhīṣaṇaḥ'.

109. See *Śrīraṅgamāhātmya,* Ch.VI. śl.10-11.

110. *Ṛgveda,* III.62.10a.

111. *Chāndogya* XVI.6

112. *Ṛgveda* I.115.1b.

113. *Tai. Brā.* III.VII.5.4.

114. *Taitt. Āraṇyaka* III.II.4.

115. *Bhagavad Gītā* VII.16.

116. *ibid.* III.30.

117. See *ibid.* IX.29.

118. *Tai.Up.,* III.1.

119. *Tai. Ā.* III.11.

120. *Mahānārāyaṇa,* IX.3.

121. See *Rāmāyaṇa* (VI.18. 33b-34a) 'sakṛdeva prapannāya'...

122. *Chāndogya* VI.VIII.7.

123. Cf: *Bhagavad Gītā* (VII.18), 'udārāssarva evaite..'

24. For a detailed study of these fragments see Gerhard Oberhammer, Materialien Zur Geschichte Der Rāmānuja Schule, 'Parāśarabhaṭṭa's *Tattvaratnā karaḥ'.* See Appendix I of this book for a list of these fragments.

25. *Yatīndramatadīpikā,* p.51.

26. See *Tarkasaṁgraha,* p.135 and *Vedāntaparibhāṣā,* p.60.

127. Cf: *YMD,* p.9 and *Śrībhāṣya,* pp. 29-30.

128. See *Yāmuna's Contribution to Viśiṣṭādvaita,* pp. 165-166.

129. The readings found in this fragment seem to be corrupt and hence a proper understanding of this passage was a little difficult. The commentary *Nyāyasāra* of Śrīnivāsācārya on Vedānta Deśika's *Nyāyapariśuddhi* (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series) is quite useful in this connection.

130. Some of the ācārya-s of this school seem to be divided regarding the status of *Arthāpatti* as a separate *pramāṇa.* Meghanādāri accepts *Arthāpatti* as a separate *pramāṇa* along with *Upamāna.* (See *Nayadyumaṇi,* pp. 214-219). The present fragment of *Tattvaratnākara* which contains the statement 'divātana-aśana-niṣedha-mātraparaṁ cet śrutārthā patteḥ' appears to be in favour of *Śruta-arthāpatti* as a separate means although *Arthāpatti* in general is earlier denied an independent status. Earlier Yāmunācārya in his *Ātmasiddhi* tried to prove the existence of the individual soul *(ātman)* on the strength of Śrutārthāpatti (See *Ātmasiddhi,* pp. 139-140). Scriptural passages such as *jyotiṣṭemena svarga-kāmo yajeta* become incompatible if the existence of an abiding self is not accepted. Hence this becomes a *pramāṇa.* But how to account for this apparent contradiction? The word *śrutārthapatti* should not be interpreted as a separate classification of *arthāpatti* but as 'an implication' found in the statements heard. It can thus be included in *Śabdapramāṇa* itself.

131. *Chāndogya* VIII.XI.5.

132. *Muṇḍaka.* II.I.3.

133. See *Nyāyapariśuddhi* (NP.) pp.370-371.

134. See Yāmuna's *Āgamaprāmāṇya* (Critical Edition) pp.68-69.

135. Yāmuna's *Āgamaprāmāṇya* and the *Pāñcarātra* section (II.ii. 39-42) of the *Śrībhāṣya* are the two texts implied here by Parāśara.

136. On Kāśakṛtsna see the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* Vol. IV, p.115 (a,b). See also *Adhikaraṇasārāvali,* śl. 15: 'saṅkarṣaḥ kāśakṛtsnaprabhavaḥ..'.

137. See *Śrībhāṣya,* pp. 3-4 and *NP.* p.480.

138. See *NP.* p.494.

139. See *Yogasūtra* of Patañjali (3.22); 'prātibhādvā sarvam'.

140. See *Nyāyasiddhāñjana* (NS) p.72.

141. Cf: *Ātmasiddhi,* p.160.

142. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka.* IV.iii.9.

143. *ibid.* IV.iii.6.

144. *ibid.* IV.iii.9.

145. On the authority of *NS.* p.562 ff, we understand that Parāśara is here refuting the *Sphoṭa* theory of the Grammarians.

146. See *NS.* pp.600-601 for more explicit it reference to the *pīlu* and *piṭhara-pāka-vādas.*

147. They are published by Sri. A. Srinivasaraghavan along with the *Viṣṇusahasranāmastotrabhāṣya* of Parāśara (pp. XIX—XXIII).

148. 5 of these verses along with Parāsara's commentary were published serially in the *Vedānta Dīpikā,* Vol.XXVII. Part II pp. 15-21 III (pp.88-90), Part

IV (pp.121-124), Part II VIII (pp.189-192) and Part IX (pp.227-229). A commentary of unknown authorship on the verse *"tvam-me' haṁ me"* alone is available in the form of a palm-leaf manuscript in *grantha* characters deposited in the French Institute of Indology, Pondicherry, under No.20794, folios 24b-27b.D. The verses were published serially in the *Yatirāja Pādukā,* Vol. III, Part V, (pp.16-20), Part VI (pp.9-12), Part XII (pp.36-38) and Vol.IV, Part I (pp.12-15) and Part II (pp.35-37).

149. All the available *Tirumañjanakavi*-s are given in Appendix II of this book.

150. See *Yājñavalkya-smṛti,* II. 22.95 which refers to ten kinds of taking such an oath.

151. See Francis Thompson, 'The Hound of Heaven', *An Anthology of Longer Poems,* pp.238-243.

152. Cf: *Taniyan* of Bhaṭṭa: 'Śrī Parāśara-bhaṭṭāryaḥ *śrīraṅgeśa-purohitaḥ'.*

CHAPTER IV

1. Cf: *Śrīguṇaratnakośa,* śl.6
stotāraṁ tamuśanti devi kavayo yo vistṛṇīte guṇān, stotavyasya,' etc.

2. *ibid.* śl.7. sūktim samagrayatu naḥ svayameva lakṣmīḥ.

3. See *Kāvyaprakāśa,* I.4(a):
tadadoṣau śabdārthau saguṇāvanalaṅkṛtī punaḥ kvāpi.

4. *Dhvanyāloka,* II.10:
samarpakatvaṁ kāvyasya yattu sarvarasān prati saprasādo guṇo jñeyaḥ sarvasādhāraṇakriyaḥ

5. *Ibid,* II.33:
sarveṣveva prabhedeṣu sphuṭatvenāvabhāsanaṁ yad vyaṅgyasya aṅgībhūtasya tat pūrṇaṁ dhvanilakṣaṇam.

6. See *Dhvanyāloka,* II.p.119:
tatprakāśanaparaścārtho'napekṣitadīrghasamāsa-racanaḥ prasannavācakābhidheyaḥ

7. See *Pratāparudrīya, Guṇaprakaraṇa,* p.234: *avaiṣamyena bhaṇanam.*

8. See *Pratāparudrīya, Guṇaprakaraṇa,* p.236: *atyujjvalatvaṁ bandhasya.*

9. Pratāparudrīya, Guṇaprakaraṇa, p.237: *supāṁ tiṅāṁ ca vyutpattiḥ.*

10. See *VSB,* p.406.

11. The translations of the *sūtra*-s given here are mostly from 'The *Siddhāntakaumudī*', translated in English by S.C. Vasu.

12. See *Amarakośa,* I.i.545:
vā puṁsi padmam.

13. Vide *Amarakośa* I.i.268:
prakāṇḍamuddhatallajau.

CHAPTER V

1. Cf: NS. *Bhaṭṭaparāśarapādaiḥ; Tattvaratnākarakāraiḥ,* etc.

2. See fragments 7, 17 and 29.

3. See *NS.* p.143.

4. See *Śrībhāṣya,* pp.3—4.

5. See Appendix I, fragment No. 21.

6. Vide: *Aṣṭaślokī,* V.1.a. 'jagadudayarakṣāpraḷayakṛt'

7. *SRJS,* II.30.
8. *ibid.* II.41.
9. *ibid.* II.44.
10. See *Brahmasūtra,* II.i.34.
11. Cf: *Bṛhadarāṇyaka* [iv.iv.5]: sādhukārī sādhurbhavati
12. See *VSB,* p.126: 'avarasya ātmanaḥ svābhāvikaṁ jñānādivat..' etc.
13. Cf: *Vedārthasaṅgraha,* p.76.
14. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* 5.7: yasya pṛthvī śarīram; yasya āpaḥ śarīram; yasya ātmā śarīram'.
15. See *VSB,* p.126 (on name no.12).
16. See Prof. M.R. Sampathkumaran's English translation of Rāmānuja's *Gītābhāṣya,* Introduction, p.XXV.
17. Cf: *Bhagavad-Gītā* (VII:14): māmeva ye prapadyante..'
18. See *SRJS* II.27-31: *VSB* pp.254, 289-290. See also the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (VI.v.79) which defines the term *bhagavān* as the possessor of *bhaga* which is the name of six qualities, viz., knowledge, power of action, sustaining strength, sovereignty, energy and radiance, and opposed to blemishes.
19. For an etymology of this word (vyūḥ) ('to shove asunder'), see F. Otto Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā,* p.40.
20. *SGRK.* śl.7-8, 16-18.
21. *ibid.* śl. 32-33.
22. *ibid.* 19-30; *SRJS.* II.44.
23. *SGRK* 47.

24. *ibid.* 48.

25. *ibid.* 54.

26. *SRJS.* II.44.

27. *VSB,* name no.73.

28. *SGRK* śl. 52.

29. See Yāmuna's *Catuśślokī* and Rāmānuja's *Śaraṇāgatigadya,* introductory paragraph.

30. *Yādavābhyudaya,* IV.9.

31. *SRJS,* II.37.

32. *Varadarājapañcāśat,* śl.16.

33. See the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* Vol. I. pp.455-456.

34. This information is taken from the notes available with the *New Catalogus Catalogorum,* Department of Sanskrit, Unviersity of Madras.

CHAPTER VI

1. His *Lakṣmīkalyāṇanāṭaka* is unfortunately not available.

2. See *VSB,* Introductory śl.3: bhūyo bhaṭṭaparāśareti phaṇitaḥ śrīraṅgabhartrā svayam.

3. See *SRJS,* I.17.

4. Cf: *Taniyan* on Parāśara 'śrīraṅgeśapurohita..' etc., attributed to Nañjīyar, Parāśara's disciple.

5. *See Nārāyaṇa's commentary on SGRK,* p.1. 'dramiḍopaniṣadgabhīrāśayavivaraṇacaṇaḥ..' etc.

6. See pp. 59-60 of this book.

kāśakṛtsnaprabhava iti kathaṁ tattvaratnākaroktiḥ, atra brūmaḥ saduktau na vayamiha mudhā bādhitum kiñcidarhāḥ..'

8. See Dr V. Varadhachari, 'Antiquity of the term Viśiṣṭādvaita', *Viśiṣṭādvaita - A Symposium,* p.109.
9. Cf: *Viṣṇusahasranāma,* śl.3. 'kim japan mucyate jantuḥ janmasaṁsārabandhanāt'.
10. See *SRJS* I.3. 'rāmānujamunirjīyāt..' etc.
11. See fragment 20: 'bhāṣyakṛd-yāmunāryaiḥ'.
12. Cf: 'putraste jātaḥ'.
13. See *SRJS,* II.22: 'atrāste nidhiḥ...tvayi sakalāḥ samanvayante' and Cf: *Śrībhāṣya,* I.i.4: 'samanvayaḥ samyaganvayaḥ; puruṣārthatayā anvayaḥ ityarthaḥ'.
14. *SRJS,* I.1: 'śrīvatsacihnamiśrebhyaḥ..' etc.
15. Cf: *Śrīstava,* śl. 1 with *SGRK* śl. 4 and śl.22.
16. Cf: *Śrīstava* śl.2 with *SGRK,* śl.7.
17. *SGRK,* śl.6.
18. *ibid.* śl.2.
19. *Śrīstava,* śl.7 and 11.
20. *Śrīraṅgarājastava,* I.68, 112.
21. *Kenopaniṣad.* II.3.
22. *Śrīraṅgarājastava* I.13.
23. *Periyatiruvantādi,* stanza 2.
24. *Tiruvāymoḻhi,* III.i.1.
25. *Śrīraṅgarājastava,* verse I.91.
26. *Perumāḷtirumoḻhi,* I.2.
27. *SRJS,* I.59.

20.	NP	pp. 475—476
21.	NP	p. 480
	TK	p.89
22.	NP	p. 481
	TK	p. 78
	(Śrutaprakāśikā p. 73	
23.	NP	p. 485
24.	NP	pp. 494—495
25.	NS	p. 70
26.	NS	p. 72
27.	NS	p. 122
28.	NS	pp. 141—142
29.	NS	pp. 502—509
30.	NS	511
31.	NS	515
32.	NS	pp. 569—570
33.	NS	p. 582
34.	NS	pp. 599—60
35.	NS	pp. 611—612
36.	NS	pp. 650—651
37.	NS	pp. 660—661
38.	NS	pp. 674—675
39.	NS	pp. 691—693
40.	TMK	pp. 311
41.	SM	p. 50
42.	SM	p. 62

१ ‘‘कश्चैष संशयः कतिविधश्च? एकस्मिन् धर्मिणि विरुद्धानेकविशेषासभासः संशयः । स च द्विविधः’’

२. ‘‘प्रत्यक्षादिमूलानां स्मृतीनां स्वस्वमूलेऽन्तर्भावविवक्षया प्रमाणात्रित्वाविरोधः । चतुष्ट्वे च वैदिकानुवादो दर्शितः .... स्मृतिः प्रत्यक्षमैतिह्यनुमानं चतुष्टचम् इति प्रत्यक्षाद्यविशेषेण वेदानुवादाच्च’’.

३. ‘‘अपरोक्षप्रमाध्यक्षमापरोक्ष्यं च संविदः ।
व्यवहार्यार्थसंबन्धिज्ञानजत्वविवर्जनम् ॥

...परोक्ष्यं व्यवहार्यानन्तर्गतवस्तुवेदनापेक्षा । तदनन्तर्गतलिङ्गाद्यपेक्षा पारोक्ष्यमनुमादौ’’

४. ‘‘अत्र वृद्धा विदामासुः संयोगः संनिकर्षणम् ।
संयुक्ताश्रयणं चेति यथासंभवमूह्यताम् ॥’’

५. ‘‘विशेषणानां स्वायोगव्यावृत्तिरविकल्पके ।
सविकल्पेऽन्ययोगस्य व्यावृत्तिः संज्ञिता तथा ॥

...द्विविधं चैतत् प्रत्यक्षम्- अर्वाचीनमनर्वाचीनं च । युगपदशेषविषयसाक्षात्कारक्षममनर्वाचीनम् । तत् योगिमुक्तेश्वराणां प्रभावविशेषाधीनमुपपादयिष्यते’’

६. ‘‘संबन्धोऽयं सकृद्ग्राह्यः प्रतीतिस्वरसात् तथा ।
प्रतीतयो हि स्वरसाद्धर्मधर्म्यवधीन् विदुः ॥’’

...संनिहितधूमादिव्यक्तिसंयुक्तस्येन्द्रियस्य तदाश्रितधूमवत्वादिः संयुक्ताश्रितः, तदाश्रयत्वेन व्यक्त्यन्तराणि संप्रयुक्तानि ...

तृतीयः संनिकर्षोऽयं संनिकर्षनिरूपणे ।
अनुक्तस्तत्प्रमेयस्य व्याप्तेरत्रैव साधनात् ॥’’

७. ‘‘केनचिद्यस्य संबन्धे योऽवच्छेदक एष हि ।
तस्योपाधिर्यथा वह्नेरार्द्रेधोधूमसंगमे ॥

श्रोत्रत्वयोगे नभसो यथा वा कर्णशुष्कुली ।
संसारयोगे जीवस्य कर्माविद्यादि वा यथा ॥

साध्यव्यापकः साधनाव्यापक इति तं लक्षयन्ति । केचित् साधनाव्यापकः साध्यसमव्याप्तिरिति च ... किमस्य ज्ञापकम्? साधनस्य क्वचित् साध्यासंबन्धख्यापकं, संबन्धग्रहणवेलानुयायिस्वरूपवैकल्पयं वा । असंबन्धख्यापकं च व्यभिचारदर्शनम् । तच्च साध्यविरुद्धधर्मकतया निश्चिते प्रमाणबाधिते पक्षे विपक्षे वा हेतोर्दर्शनम् । अग्नीषोमीयशास्त्रबाधिते पक्षे दृष्टं हि हिंसात्वं निषिद्धत्वमात्मन उपाधिं कल्पयति । प्रमेयत्वं च नित्यात्मादिपक्षे दृष्टमनित्यत्वसाधने कृतकत्वादिकमुपाधीकरोति । सपक्षेषु य यावद्रूपविशिष्टतया साधनं साध्यसंबन्धित्वेन दृष्टम्; तदन्यतरूपविपलं चेत् पक्षे दृश्यते, तदा व्याप्तरूपाप्रत्यभिज्ञानात् सर्वरूपविशिष्टमेवोपाधयति; यथा-भावितनयश्यामलिमनि अनुमेयेमित्रापुत्रत्वं भूतपुत्रेषु दृष्टं शाकाद्याहारपरिणामविशेषम् । एवंजातीयके रूपवैकल्यकल्पितोपाधिके हेतावप्रयोजकत्वव्यपदेशः परीक्षकाणाम्; व्यभिचारकल्पितोपाधिकयोस्तु बाधितो विरुद्धोऽनैकान्तिक इति तदेष संक्षेपः - व्यभिचार एव प्रतिबन्धाभावः । उपाधिरेव व्यभिचारनिदानम् । प्रमाणानिश्चित एवोपाधित्वेन शङ्कनीयः । साधने सोपाधिः साध्ये निरुपाधिरेवोपाधित्वेन निश्चेयः । सर्वशङ्कातिप्रसङ्गपाटनपटीयांश्च तर्कः'' ।

८. '' अक्षपादस्त्रैधमसूत्रयत् .... इयं हि अतध्यवसितकेवल्यतिरेकिणोभिदा । विद्यमानसपक्षोऽपि

पक्षमात्रवृत्तिः प्रथमः । अन्यस्त्वविद्यमानसपक्षो विपक्षाद्व्यावृत्त इति । तत्र दृष्टे साध्यवति सपक्षे साधनस्य ततो व्यावृत्तावन्वयबाधादाभासत्वं स्पष्टम् । अदृष्टे तु तस्मिन् साध्यान्वयाक्षेपकपूर्वोक्तप्रमाणावतारादनाभासत्वं सुवचम्''

९. ''अर्थासाधारणाकारप्रतिपत्तिनिबन्धनम् ।
सजातीयविजातीयव्यवच्छेदेन लक्षणम् ॥....

न चायं जात्यादिराकारः प्रमेयं निष्कृष्य लक्षयतः प्रमाणस्य सजातीयविजातीयव्यवच्छेदांशे सहकारीति लक्षणमुच्यते''

१०. ''क्षोण्यादिलक्ष्यं प्रमाणसिद्धं न वा? तदसिद्धावाश्रयासिद्धिर्लक्षणात्मनो हेतोः । सिद्धौ च साधनं सुधा । स्वरूपसिद्धावपि व्यवच्छेदः साध्यत इति चेत्, तादृगेव तदपि; तथापि ह्यप्रसिद्धविशेषणः पक्षः स्यात्, इतरव्यवच्छेदस्य क्वचिदनालोचितचरत्वात्, सिद्धौ वा साधनवैयर्थ्यात् । किं च प्रमाणस्य स्वविषयव्यवस्थायां प्रमाणान्तरापेक्षणादनवस्थितिपरतः प्रमाण्ये प्रसज्येभाताम् ॥

तस्माद्धर्मः प्रमेयात्मा धर्मिनिष्कर्षमाचरन् ।
लक्षणं न प्रमाणात्मेत्युक्तयैव दिशा गतिः ॥''

११. ''सर्वं प्रमाणं सामग्र्या स्वत एव प्रवृत्तया ।
जन्यते परवाक्येन वृत्तया चेति हि द्विधा ॥

अतोनुमानं द्विविधं स्वपरार्थत्वभेदतः ।
प्रत्यक्षागमसामग्र्योः परवाक्ये प्रदर्शिते ॥

वक्ष्यते व्यवहाराध्वन्यनुमानस्य तूच्यते ।
अनुमोद्बोधकं वाक्यं प्रयोगः साधनं च तत् ॥''

१२. ''अतश्च सर्वत्र पञ्चावयववाक्यमाद्रियन्ते वेदाचार्यादयः — 'पञ्चावयवयुक्तस्य वाक्यस्य गुणदोषवित्-' इत्यादौ .... न च सर्वदा सर्वेवयवाः प्रयोज्याः, न इति निर्बध्नीमः, वक्तृप्रतिवक्तृसंप्रतिपत्तौ लघूपायोपादानोपि दोषाभावात्, लोकेपि तथा व्यवहाराच्च.... प्रतिपत्तपेक्षया विकल्पसमुच्चयावेव, अविरोधात्.... प्रतिज्ञायाः परं हेतूदाहरणयोर्न क्रमनिर्बन्धः, व्याप्तिहेतुप्रदर्शने विशेषाभावात्.... सोयं गवयपदाभिधेयः, गोसहशत्वात्; य इत्थम्, स तथा, यथोक्तमाप्तेन; अयं च

गोसदृशः; ततस्तत्पदवाच्याः.....
व्याप्तौ दृष्टान्तदृश्यायामवश्यं स निदर्श्यते ।
आगमाद्व्याप्तितसिद्धौ न व्याप्तिस्मृत्यर्थमीयते ॥
धूमवानग्निमानेवेत्याप्तोक्तायां तथा गतिः ॥''

१३. छलजात्योरेकान्तविजयाभावेन त्याज्यत्वम्, कदाचिदवष्टम्भ-विजयावहत्वमात्रेण तत्त्वाध्यवसायसंरक्षकत्वम्, अन्यदन्यदपि विस्तरेण तत्त्वरत्नाकरे प्रत्यपादि ।

१४. ''अमूषां जातीनामानन्त्याच्चतुर्विंशतिरसौ प्रदर्शनार्था 'अन्यदन्यस्मात्' इत्यादिना जात्यन्तरसूचनात्''

१५. ''ईदृक्षपक्षाद्यङ्गानामेकैकविकलत्वतः ।
सर्वानुमानाभासानां संक्षेपाल्लक्ष्य सूचितम् ॥

तत्तत्पक्षादिरूपतत्त्वमतदपि तथा भासमानं तदाभासः । तत्र,

पञ्च प्रतिज्ञार्थाभासाः पक्षवैकल्यदोषजाः ।
सिद्धप्रसिद्धबाधित्वविरुद्धत्वाफलत्वतः ॥

अवाचकसंदिग्धाश्लिलनिर्देशादयः साधनादिष्वपि साधारणनिर्देशदोषा द्रष्टव्याः । एते च लक्षणवाक्ये पक्षधर्मपदेन व्यावर्त्यत्वात् सर्वे प्रतिज्ञाभासाः.....

अथ
हेतवोसिद्धानध्यवसितविरुद्धविशेषणविरुद्धानैकान्तिकाप्रयोजकबाध्य विरुद्धाव्यभिचारिप्रकरणसमसिद्धसाधनाः इति दशधा । तत्रासिद्धोप्रमितपक्षधर्मभावः । स स्वतो नवधा....

सर्वानुमानाभासानां तल्लक्ष्मावयवक्षतिः ।
व्याप्यत्वपक्षधर्मत्वहानिर्वा लघु लक्षणम् ॥''

१६. ''अपरे पुनः सकलप्रमाणाणां तर्कानुग्राह्यतामाग्रादुदाहरन्ति ... तदा तर्कापेक्षाध्यवसायविरुद्धम्......

नैनं तर्कमपेक्षन्ते सर्वाः प्रमितयो यतः ।
विरोधाबोधयोर्जातं संशयं स चिकित्सते ॥''

१७. ''एषां प्रसङ्गद्वारेण वा प्रयोगः ... तन्निध्वकाशमानाल्लिङ्गादिह सावकाशस्यात्माविरुद्धविषभस्थापनाविषयानुमानमर्थापत्तिः । इयमेवागमविषयव्यवस्थितौ शेषभूता चेत् सामान्यविशेषाख्यो न्यायो निर्दिश्यते ... पीनो देवदत्तो दिवा न भुङ्क्ते इत्येतदपि शत्रिभोजनपर्यन्ततात्पर्यं चेत् अध्याहारस्योदाहरणम्; दिवातनाशनविषेधमात्रपरं चेच्छ्रुतार्थापत्तेः । यस्य हि प्रमाणस्य यावत् प्रमेयं व्यवस्थापितं, तत् तावत्यप्रमिते न स्वातन्त्र्येण पर्यवस्यति; तदा तत्पर्यवसानार्थतयाऽनुपपत्तिलिङ्गदिकं व्याप्रियमाणं कर्तलक्षणापन्नं च्छेषतयाऽवतिष्ठते, परोद्देशप्रवृत्तव्यापाख्याप्यत्वात्, प्रमित्सितपर्यवसाने तत्प्रमेयस्वभावपर्यालोचनया स्वातन्त्र्येण व्याप्रियमाणं तर्कप्रमाणपदं समधिरोहति....

★ यद्यप्येवं न तर्कः स्वातन्त्र्येण स्वान्तसमर्थनसमर्थः तथाप्यागमानुग्रहेण प्रभवति, सन्ति चागमाः — मनसैतान् कामान् पश्यन् रमते - मनोऽस्य दिव्यं चक्षुः - सोऽन्यं

कामं मनसा ध्यायीतमनसैव जगत् सृष्टं - एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च इत्येवमादयः परावरप्रकरणेषु....

यदुक्तं न प्रमाणेन परीक्षा दोषवन्न तत् ।
अप्रमाणेन तर्केण परीक्षा वक्ष्यते यतः ॥
मानानुग्राहकं युक्त्या ज्ञानं तर्कोऽभिधीयते ।
युक्तिश्च संभवौचित्यतद्विपर्ययतो द्विधा ॥
केचिदाक्षते तर्कः प्रमाणमिति मन्महे
संशयादिबहिर्भावात् प्रमाण्यस्य च संभवात् ॥

प्रसङ्गरूपव्यतिरेक्यनुमानमेव तर्कः....

उच्यते न प्रमा तर्को वेषहेत्वोर्विशेषतः ।
हेत्वाभासोद्भवाच्च सोऽहं निर्णायको न च ॥...

न स सिद्धान्तः, तथाह्येत्वं भवितव्यम् ..... संभवासंभवपरामर्शस्तर्कः - यथा - बाह्वादिप्रदेशवत्वात् पुरुषेणानेन भवितव्यम्, न स्थाणुनेति । एषां संशयादीनां विमर्शनवधारणाद्येकप्रयोजनान्तर्भावसंभवेऽपि पृथगुपादानमवान्तरकारणवैषम्यात्, उपयोगभेदस्य च न्यायपादे दर्शयिष्यमाणत्वाच्च .....न केवलं प्रसङ्गसाधनं साध्यधर्मिण्यसिद्धम्, अपि त्वन्यगतमेव प्रसङ्गहेतुः, न त्वनुमानमन्यगताद्धर्मात् प्रवर्तते । ततस्तस्मात् स्फुटोऽस्य भेदः ...

८. अभिधानाभिधेयत्वमतः शब्दार्थयोः स्थितम् ।
संबन्धोऽत्राभिधा द्वेधा बोध्या भुख्यजघन्यतः ॥
अभिधार्थावगत्यात्मा शब्दं व्यापारयिष्यतः ।
शब्दशक्तिनिमित्ता सा स्वार्थे मुख्याभिधीयते ॥
स्वार्थाभिधानद्वारा स्याज्जघन्यार्थान्तरे मता ।''

१९. "अवश्याश्रयणीयेयमन्विताथाभिधायिता ।
इत्याहुर्यामुनाचार्याः पदैरवान्विताभिधाम् ॥

षड्भिः प्रतीतिप्रमुखोपपत्तिभि-
निर्धूतचोद्याभिरिहान्विताभिधा ।
सिद्धा पदैर्नाभिहितान्वयस्थिति-
र्विपर्ययादित्यखिलं समञ्जसम् ॥"

२०. "उपनिषदि तु बह्वयां व्यावघोष्यामदोष-
प्रतिहतगुणराशिर्घुष्यते ताक्ष्र्यकेतुः ।
श्रुतिरपि तदुपज्ञैः पञ्चरात्रैर्विकल्पं
न लभत इति सूक्तं भाष्यकृद्यामुनार्यैः ॥

२१. "कर्मदेवताब्रह्मगोचरा सा त्रिधोद्भवौ सूत्रकारतः ।
जैमिनेर्मुनेः काशकृत्स्नते बादरायणादित्यतः क्रमात् ॥"

२२. "धर्मधीमानभेदाङ्गप्रयुक्तिक्रमकर्तृभिः ।
सातिदेशविशेषोहबाधतन्त्रप्रसक्तिभिः ॥"

२३. "यथार्थनिश्चयो मानं तद्धेतुश्चेति सूरयः ।
नातिव्याप्तिः स्मृतौ व्याप्तिर्यथार्थेन हि सा प्रमा ॥

... अनुभूतविषयासंप्रमोषः स्मृतिः; यथा - स घट इति । ननु
ामपि व्याप्नोति लक्षणम्; सत्यम्; तद्व्याप्तौ नातिव्याप्तिः, तस्यापि
क्ष्यपक्षे निक्षेपात् ।

लक्ष्यालक्ष्य अनालक्ष्य क्षिप्यते लक्षणं कथम् ।
लोके धीव्यवहारं हि लक्ष्यालक्ष्यावधिं विदुः ॥

२४. " व्युत्पन्नबोध्यबोधकनियमं चेत् चेष्टितं शाब्दम् । अनियतमपि

ननु च प्रतिभा काचित् यथार्था मानमिष्यातम् ।
बाह्यार्थनैरपेक्ष्येण बाह्यज्ञानक्षमास्तु सा ॥

विशिष्टकालपुरुषाद्यपेक्षोत्कर्षसंभवा ।
सत्यं कालादिभेदस्तु दुर्विवेचोऽस्मदादिभिः ॥

सन्नप्यसौ व्यवहृतौ नोपयोगीत्युपेक्ष्यते ।
प्रतिभायाः फलं दृष्टं यदा प्रमाण्यनिश्चयः ॥

तदन्यतः कृतार्थत्वात् प्रेक्ष्यते न परीक्षकैः ।
पुण्येषु पुरुषेष्वेषा भूयिष्टं सत्यदर्शिनी ॥

तस्मात् पतञ्जलिः प्राह प्रतिभाचेति तां प्रमाम् ॥''

२५. ''तच्छ षोढा.... आन्तरं मनः''

२६ ''कर्णशष्कुलीशरीरनयनगोलकरसानानासिकाधिष्ठानानि च तानि''

२७. ''निपुरनिरीक्षणे च जलवेणिकावत् ज्वालासञ्चरणं दृश्यते''

२८. ''बध्नाति यदभिद्रोहाद् यत्प्रपत्त्या च मुञ्चाते ।
जन्तूंस्तमस्तमाश्रित्य हरिं यत् प्रविविच्यते ॥

अतो न काकदन्तानामिव तस्य परीक्षणम् ।
उपेक्ष्यं बन्धकत्वस्य ज्ञाने हानप्रयोजनात् ॥

तत्स्वरूपतदुत्पत्तिग्राहकादिषु सूरयः ।
विवदन्ते ततो जातः सन्देहनिचन्त्यतेऽधुना ॥

अत्रालोकाभावस्तम इति काश्यपीयाः । नास्त्येव तमः, नीलभावरूपस्मृतिप्रमोष एव तमोव्यवहारहेतुरिति प्राभाकराः । द्रव्यान्तरमेवेदं कल्प्यमिति कौमारिलाः । प्रधानतत्त्वमेव तम इति तत्त्वविद...

अत्र तत्त्वविदः प्राहुः स्थूलसूमात्मना स्थिता ।
दैवी गुणमयी माया बाह्यान्तरतमो मता ॥''

२९. ''धियः प्रत्यक्षभावत्वात् परतस्तदसम्भवात् ।
पारिशेष्यात्स्वतोभानं प्रमाणाच्च ततस्ततः ॥

प्रतीतेर्व्याहरणतः सन्देहपरिवर्जनात् ।
सत्तायां सिद्धवत्करात् ज्ञानं भातीति भावितम् ॥

परस्यादर्शनाद्व्याप्तदन्वयिव्यतिरेकितः ।
अर्थापत्तेश्च युक्तेश्च वचनाच्च स्वदृङ्गतिः ॥

...विप्रतिपन्ना संवित् स्वगतव्यवहारं प्रति स्वाधीनकिञ्चित्कारे सजातीयसंबन्धानपेक्षा व्यवहारहेतुत्वात् अर्थेन्द्रिद्रयदीपादिवत्। न च चक्षुषः सजातीयतेजोपेक्षयाऽनैकान्त्यम्; तस्येन्द्रियत्वेन, आहङ्कारिकत्वेन वा, आलोकाद्भिन्नजातीयत्वात्। अन्यच्च, ज्ञानसंस्कारः स्वैकार्थसमावायि-ज्ञानानुभवानपेक्षः संस्कारत्वादन्यसंस्कारवत्, विषयसंस्कारो... ज्ञानसंस्कारेण सहोत्पद्यते विषयसंस्कारत्वादिदमहं जानामीति ज्ञानप्रभवसंस्कारवत्। न चोभयविषयज्ञानपूर्वकत्वं प्रयोजकम्; ज्ञानपूर्वत्वेन व्याप्तिसिद्धिर्व्यर्थविशेषणत्वात् ... पुनश्च ... संविदनन्याधीनस्वधर्म-व्यवहारा, [स्वसंबन्धादर्थान्तरे तद्धर्मव्यवहारहेतुत्वात्। यः स्वसंबन्धादर्थान्तरे तद्धर्मव्यवहारहेतुः, स तयोः स्वस्मिन् अनन्याधीनो दृष्टः, यथा रूपादिश्चाक्षुषत्वादौ] ... व्यतिरेकि चास्ति लिङ्गम् ... ज्ञानं न परप्रकाश्यम्, घटादिवदर्थाप्रकाशकत्वप्रसङ्गात्... वचनानि च ... अत्रायं पुरुषः स्वयंज्योतिर्भवति, आत्मैवास्य ज्योतिः; स्वेन ज्योतिषाऽऽस्ते, आत्मसंवेद्यं तज्ज्ञानं ब्रह्मसंज्ञितम् इत्यादीनि ज्ञानपदवाच्यजीवस्य स्वयंज्योतिष्ट्वपराणि ज्ञानपदाभिधेयायां संविद्यपि

ांभवलाघवाभ्यां स्वप्रकाशत्वं संभावयन्ति ... मणितरणिदीपतत्प्रभा-
ाधर्म्येण जीवतज्ज्ञानसमर्थनानि च

यथा प्रकाशयत्येकः कृत्सनं लोकमिमं रविः।
क्षेत्रं क्षेत्री तथा कृत्सनं प्रकाशयति भारत॥

त्येवंविधानि ज्ञानात्मनोः स्वयम्प्रभावत्त्वेन सजतीयत्वं ज्ञापयन्ति, न
ा किञ्चिदनिष्टं प्रसज्येत''

0. ''योग्यानवग्रहास्वेन सम्भवादनवस्थितेः।
इति बाधकहेतुभ्यः साधनद्वितयस्य च॥
असिद्धिव्यभिचाराभ्यां वैकल्यात्साध्यसाधने।
इत्यसाधनबाधाभ्यां न धीर्मानसगोचरः॥
इति स्वतस्सिद्धिरेव संवित्सिद्धौ च पद्धतिः।

1. ''संकोचेऽपि करणसंप्रयोगावाधिकस्यैर्याभ्युपगमात्''

2. ''प्राक्प्रयोगानुसारेण प्रकृतिप्रत्ययस्वरान्।
प्रकल्प्य वैयाकरणैर्व्युत्पाद्या पदपद्धतिः॥''

3. ''गगनगुणशब्दादिस्वरूपस्थितीः प्रवर्तयता भगवतैव योग्यार्थैदमर्थ्येन
वाक्यप्रवाहस्य पूर्वमेवोपात्तत्वात्''

4. ''न खलु पूर्वरूपविनाशिकैव व्यक्तिरुत्तरोत्पादिका, पाकलक्षणाग्नि-
संयोगानां भिन्नत्वात्''

5. ''न चाजसंयोगमन्तरेण किञ्चिदनुपपन्नम् ... स्तम्भादेर्विभुसंयोगे किं
मानम्? न प्रत्यक्षं प्रत्यक्षाप्रत्यक्षसंयोगत्वात्। न चानुमानम्-
मूर्तद्वयाश्रयनियमादिति चेत् ... परत्वापरत्व-
शरीरगतितद्धिकारो-

36. "संख्या तु द्वितीयक्षण एव ज्ञायते, सा संख्या समवायिनोऽस्तीत्यविरोधः"

37. "तदेवं क्लृप्तैरेव द्रव्यजातिगुणकर्मभिर्धर्मैरशेषाणाम पुनरुक्त-वित्तिव्याहारव्यवहाराणामुपपत्तेर्भेदो नाम न धर्मान्तरमपूर्वं कल्प्यम्। अत एव वैशेषिकपरिक्लृप्ताः पृथक्त्वविशेषादयोऽपि प्रोत्सारिताः

नीलिमश्वेतिमानावप्यनेकावेव धर्मिणम्।
नीलं शुभ्रं च भिन्दानौ स्फुटं ह्युपलभामहे॥
ये विशेषपृथक्त्वादिसापेक्षं कल्पयन्ति ते।
बिभ्यत्वामाश्रयादिभ्यो न वयं दृष्टवादिनः॥"

38. "इन्द्रियैरर्थ्यमानत्वात् ज्ञायमानोऽर्थ उच्यते।
द्रव्यं जातिर्गुणः कर्मेत्यसावर्थश्चतुर्विधः॥

... जातिगुणकर्मसु सामान्यसमाश्रयणे संयुक्तसमवेत समवायसंभवात् ... द्रव्यस्य धार्मिणोऽन्तरङ्गो धर्मविशेषो जातिः। जात्यनुप्राणितस्य विशेषकः सिद्धो धर्मविशेषो गुणः। तथाविधः साध्यः क्रिया। तद्धर्मकं द्रव्यमिति स्थविष्ठानि लक्षणानि। सौक्ष्म्येण तु विवेक्ष्यन्ते प्रमेयेषु"

39. "भूयोऽवयवसामान्यं सादृश्यं बहवो विदुः।
पृथक्प्रमेयं तदिति प्रमेये दर्शयिष्यते॥...

ननु द्रव्यत्वपृथिवीत्वशुक्लत्वपाकत्वादेः सामान्यसमाश्रयेण वाच्यानां स्वप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तानां च सन्तत्यवस्थादीनामनेकत्वादेकप्रयोजकाभावे कथमैकशब्द्यम्? वद तव वा कथम्? न ममैव एष भरः, सर्वो हि लोकः सर्वमित्यादिषु बहुष्वपि शब्दैक्यं मन्यते...

वाच्यस्वरूपेऽथ तदीयरूपे दूरादुपाधिष्वथवैकभावात्।
सादृश्यभेदाग्रहतोऽथवैषु वाच्येष्विहैकीकरणं मतं तत्॥

.. चन्द्रः सूर्य इत्यादौ वाच्यस्वरूपैक्यात्, घट पट इत्यादौ तदाकारैक्यात्''.

40. ''या वस्तुनः प्राणप्रदात्री प्रथमं प्रतीयते सा जातिः, गुणस्तु तदनुप्राणिते वस्तुनि भेदकं विशेषको धर्म इति पश्चात् प्रतीयते''.

41. ''तत्र च प्रथमाध्याये पादे च सर्वप्रामाण्येन अन्येषु च न्यायविस्तरप्रामाण्योपजीवनेन वैदिकेषु वाक्यविशेषात्मकेष्व-पौरुषेयत्वनिबन्धनं प्रामाण्यं यथा वर्णितं, तथा शब्दे प्रादीदृशाम्''

42. ''शासनमेव हि प्रेषणम्। अयमेव च विधिशब्दार्थो वेदानामभिमत इति परेऽपि केचिदनुवदन्ति, तत्त्वरत्नाकरकारैश्चोक्तम्''

|| श्रीः ||

TIRUMAÑJANA KAVI-S

''त्वं मे''ऽ''हं मे'' ''कुतस्तत्'' ''तदपि कुत'' ''इदं वेदमूलप्रमाणात्''
''एतच्चानादिसिद्धात् अनुभवविभवात्'' ''तर्हि साक्रोश एव।''
''काक्रोशः कस्य'' ''गीतादिषु मम विदितः'' ''कोऽत्र साक्षी''
सुधीः स्यात्
''हन्त त्वत्पक्षपातीस''इति नृकलहे मृग्यमध्यस्थवत् त्वम्॥ १

नानानुवृत्तिविषयं नतराजहंसं
नानाण्डजातसमधिष्ठितमब्जरम्यम्।
सेवावतीर्णसुमरुद्गणं अद्य रङ्गिन्!
भावानुरूप नदमि (इ?) त्यनुमन्महे त्वाम्॥ २

अनेकशाखाश्रितं आश्रितेभ्यो
दत्ताभिकाङ्क्ष्यं(क्षं) त्रिदशैकभोग्यम्।
सुपर्णरम्यं सुमनस्समेतं
सुरद्रुमं त्वां सुधियो वदन्ति॥ ३

मरकतमणिरम्यं रम्यमाणिक्यमुक्ता-
फलविलसितगात्रं प्रस्फुरद्गन्धवाहम्।
विहितविविधजन्तुं प्रोल्लसन्मीनलीलं
सुगमजलनिधिंत्वां (परमगेहं) मन्महे रङ्गराज!॥ ४

अमृतमयमनन्तं सिद्धसवार्थिजातं
नियमितसकलार्थं निश्चितात्मावबोधम्।
किमिह बहुनिरुक्तैः कीर्त्तनाभीष्टदं त्वां
निगममिव मनोज्ञं रङ्गराजाद्य मन्ये॥ ५

श्रीमन् सुरङ्गधरणीश! विशालशाखं
श्रीकौस्तुभस्फुरितं ईप्सितदानदक्षम्।
हंसादिसद्द्विजवरैरनुसेव्यमानं
त्वां मन्महे सुरतरुं सुरनाथनाथ! ६

भवन्तं श्रीमन्तं हसितकलिकालङ्कृतमिहा
    प्यशोकं कुर्वन्तं प्रमुदितमत्युत्सवकरम्।
सुखस्पर्शाश्लिष्यत्पवनजमहानन्दभरितं
    वसन्तं रङ्गेश! प्रकटसुमनस्कं मनुमहे॥ ७

अनिशं कुमुदं विकासयन्तं
    सततं पूर्णं अहर्निशं च दृश्यम्।
अनुपप्लवमद्य रङ्गराजं
    मनुते चन्द्रमसं जनो नु मान्यम्॥ ८

सार्धं द्विजैः श्रावणकर्म रङ्गिन्।
    कल्योचितस्नानविधिं करोषि।
श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यां व्यपदिश्यमानं
    स्वयं ममाज्ञामनुवर्तयामि॥ ९

सत्पक्षपातात् भुवनाश्रयत्वात्
    सन्मानसावासनिबन्धनत्वात्।
पद्माश्रयत्वाच्च भवानिदानीं
    हंसो यथा राजति रङ्गराज! १०

अत्यायते लसति हल्लकपुष्पमाला
    वक्षस्स्थले विनिहिता तव रङ्गराज!
स्वच्छन्दचारिकमलाचरणारविन्द-
    माणिक्यनूपुरमयूखपरम्परेव॥ ११

मणिवरशयवाही मत्स्यरूपं दधानो
    ललितधवळशङ्खो लङ्घयन् नैव वेलाम्।
विधृतभुवनभारो वीक्ष्यसे रङ्गधामन्!
अपर इव वपुष्मानापगानामधीशः॥ १२

अशेषाशापूर्तिं विदधतमनेकैः स्वविभवैः
    प्रोद्यत्कल्याणं प्रकटतरपीताम्बररुचिम्।
कृतस्वास्थ्योत्सेधात् निखिलसुमनःप्रीतिजननं
    भवन्तं मन्येऽहं सुरशिखरिणं रङ्गनृपते!॥ १३

वृत्तिर्वेगवती समाश्रितजनत्राणे भरश्चेतसः
ताम्रा कुङ्कुमपत्रिका भुजतटी ते तुङ्गभद्रोज्ज्वला।
रङ्गाधीश्वर! नर्मदा च भणितिः शोणः सुजातोऽधरः
तस्मात् स्नानविधौ जनोऽभिमनुते त्वां सर्वतीर्थात्मकम्॥ १४

सत्त्वोन्नतः सकलसत्त्वनिवासभूमिः
सौवर्णरम्यविभवः सुमनोमनोज्ञः।
सद्वृत्तसङ्घसमधिष्ठितपार्श्वदेशः
शैलात्मना स्फुरसि रङ्गमहीश्वर! त्वम्॥ १५

कुङ्कुमारुणम् उदञ्चितश्रियं
कोमलारुणसरोजसंस्थितम्।
रङ्गमन्दिरतमोनिवारणं
शङ्कते तपनदीधितिं जनः॥ १६

पद्माविधुदलङ्कृताङ्गविभवं गम्भीरनादाश्रयं
सान्द्रेन्द्रोपलकान्तिचोरवपुषं सन्तापविध्वंसिनम्।
कारुण्याम्बुभराश्रयं विदधतं सच्चातकानां मुदं
मान्यं मेघम् अमोघपूर्णफलदं रङ्गाधिपं मन्महे॥ १७

क्रियादर्शे दर्शे कृतमखविधीनामुपगते
प्रवृत्तस्नानस्त्वं परमुदयसे रङ्गतरणे।
प्रकर्षेणोद्बुद्धद्विजकुलमशेषं प्रतिदिशं
प्रहृष्टा पद्मोर्वी भवति च जगत् ध्वस्ततिमिरम्॥ १८

रङ्गेश! रजनीचर्चा राजते तव वक्षसि।
देव्या हिरण्यवर्णाया देहकान्तिरिवोदिता॥ १९

तत्तद्ग्राह्यकुदृष्टिपद्धतिमहाव्याख्याशतव्याहतं
नित्योदग्रनिजापराधदहनप्लुष्टं समस्तं जगत्।
लुप्तावग्रहलक्ष्मणार्यपदवीवर्षासमृज्जृम्भितैः
दिव्यैः संप्रति रङ्गपुङ्गव! दयावर्षैस्तवाऽऽप्लाव्यते॥ २०

अन्तस्स्थितः सुमनसाम् अमरेशरत्न-

आपादितस्मरगुणः प्रथितप्रचारः
शाखासु रङ्गनृपतिर्मधुपो विभाति॥ २१

अमृतप्रभवं प्रभाप्रभाव-
प्रहतध्वान्तलसद्विलासिजातम्।
सकलं सकलानुमोदहेतुं
शशिनं त्वां कलयामि रङ्गराज!॥ २२

समुन्मिषत्पद्मजतारसंश्रिता
तवावतारक्रमपाठतत्परा।
त्रयीव रङ्गेश! समर्थ्यते जनैः
असौ जयन्तीत्युदितेयमष्टमी॥ २३

श्यामाभं मकुटोपेतं कटकाञ्चितमुन्नतम्।
सत्त्वाश्रयं रङ्गराजं महीधरमवैम्यहम्॥ २४

सर्वस्मात् पर सांपरायसवने शक्तिस्तवेच्छात्मिका
पत्नी पात्रगणाश्चहेतिपतयः प्राप्तर्त्विजो बाहवः।
पौलस्त्याः पशवो दशाननमुखाः रक्षा फलं ज्ञानिनां
श्रीमन्! मज्जनकैतवादवभृथस्नातेव रङ्गेश्वर!॥ २५

नश्यत्सुरासुरगणं सुमनोविकास-
सत्सिद्धचारणसमूहनिषेव्यमाणम्।
ंदृष्टचारुतरसारतरामृतौघं
त्वां रङ्गराज! कलयामि हि मन्दराद्रिम्॥ २६

न्द्राकौं रङ्गधामन्! श्रवणमुपगतौ चक्षुराकारयोगात्
मान्यो मा सङ्गमस्ते सदसि बहुमतो मित्रवारप्रवेशः।
ालोऽयं पुष्यदिष्टो भवति मयि महान् तत्कटाक्षस्य यातः
त्वत्कान्त्यब्धेश्च सेतुस्त्वमसि वयमिह प्राप्ततीर्था भवामः॥ २७

त्तरीयपटिका विराजते रङ्गराज! भवतो भुजान्तरे।
त्पथे शतमखोपलप्रभे जाह्नवीव शरदभ्रनिर्मला॥ २८

BENIDICTOURY VERSES OF PARĀŚRA IN THE NĀLĀYIRAIVYAPRABANDHA

SLOKE ONE : IN OBEISANCE TO ĀLVĀR-S AND ĀCĀRYA-S

SLOKA TWO : IN OBEISANCE TO ĀṆḌĀL

SLOKD THREE AND FOUR : (IN TAMIL ALONG WITH TRANSLITERATION).

IN OBEISANCE TO NAMMĀLVĀR AND TIRUVĀYMOZHI.

भूतं सरश्च महदाह्वय-भट्टनाथ-
श्रीभक्तिसार-कुलशेखर योगिवाहान्।
भक्ताङ्घ्रिरेणु-परकाल-यतीन्द्रमिश्रान्
श्रीमत्पराङ्कुशमुनिं प्रणतोस्मि नित्यम्॥

नीलातुङ्गस्तनगिरितटीसुप्तमुद्बोध्य कृष्णम्
पारार्थ्यं स्वं श्रुतिशतशिरस्सिद्धमध्यापयन्ती।
स्वोच्छिष्टायां स्रजि निगलितं या बलात्कृत्य भुङ्क्ते
गोदा तस्यै नम इदमिदं भूय एवास्तु भूयः॥

வான்திகழும் சோலை மதிளரங்கர் வண்புகழ் மேல்
ஆன்ற தமிழ்மறைகள் ஆயிரமும், ஈன்ற
முதல் தாய் சடகோபன் மொய்ம்பால் வளர்த்த
இதத்தாயிராமானுசன்

vāntigazhum solai madiḷarangar vaṇpugazhmēl
ānra tamizhmaraigal āyiramum,-īnra
mudaltāy śaṭakopan, moimpāl vaḷartta

மிக்க இறைநிலையும் மெய்யாம் உயிர்நிலையும்,
தக்க நெறியும் தடையாகித் தொக்கியலும்,
ஊழ்வினையும் வாழ்வினையும் ஓதும் குருகையர்கோன்
யாழினிசை வேதத்தியல்.

mikka irainilaiyum meyyām uyirnilaiyum
takka neriyum tadaiyāgittokkiyalum
ūzhvinaiyum vāzhvinaiyum ōdum kurugaiyarkōn,
yāzhinisai vedattiyal.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS IN SANSKRIT:

ADHIKARAṆASĀRĀVALI : of Vedānta Deśikan with two Sanskrit Commentaries. Pub K. Lakshminarasimhacharya, Madras, 1940.

ABHIJÑĀNAŚĀKUNTALA : of Kālidāsa, Ed. & trans by M.R. Kale, Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay, 1925.

AMARAKOŚA : Niryana Sagar Press, Bombay, 1940.

AṢṬAŚLOKĪ : of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa with the (i) commentary of Śrīvat sāṅka Śrīmannārāyaṇa Jīyar, Standard Mudrākṣara Śālā, Kumbakonam, 1909.

(ii) Ed. by. T. Bheemacharya with Hindi and English translation, Bharati Publications, Indore, 1971.

ĀGAMAPRĀMĀṆYA : of Yāmunācārya Critical Edition and Study by Dr. M. Narasimhachary, Gaekwad Oriental Series, No. 160, Baroda, 1976.

ĀTMASIDDHI : See under SIDDHITRAYA

ĀHNIKAGRANTHA : of Śrīraṅganātha yatindra Mahādeśika, Śrī Gopālavilāsa Mudrākṣaraśālā, Kumbakonam.

ĪŚVARASIDDHI : See under SIDDHITRAYA

KĀDAMBARĪ : of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, Pub: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1976.

KĀVYAPRAKĀŚA : of Mammaṭa, Ānandāśrama, Sanskrit Series 89, 1921.

KRIYĀDĪPA : ascribed to Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, Pub. along with several Nitya grantha-s, Bangalore, 1897.

GADYATRAYA : of Śrī Rāmānuja with the commentary by Vedānta Deśika, Vedānta Deśika Granthamāla, Kāñcī, 1940.

GOṢṬHĪSTAVA : ascribed to Parāśara, Pub. in a souvenir by the Śrī Ahobila Utsava Committee, Madras, 1981.

CATUŚŚLOKĪ : of Yāmunācārya with the commentary by Vedānta Deśika, Vedānta Deśika Granthamāla, Kāñcī, 1940.

TATTVAṬĪKĀ : of Vedānta Deśika, Pub. Śrīvaiṣṇava Siddhānta Pracāra Sabhā, Madras, 1938.

TATTVAMUKTĀKALĀPA: of Vedānta Deśika with the commentary Sarvārthasiddhi (i) with Ānandadāyinī and Bhāvaprakāśa, vol.I and II, University of Mysore Sanskrit Series, 1938 and 1940.

(ii) Ed. by P.B. Aṇṇaṅgarācārya Svāmin, Madras, 1941.

TARKASAṄGRAHA : of Annambhaṭṭa, with Dipikā, Prākaśikā and Bālāpriyā, Ed. by Dr. N. Veezhinathan, Madras, 1980.

TĀTPARYACANDRIKĀ : See under BHAGAVAD GITĀBHĀṢYA

DIVYASURICARITA : of Garuḍavāhana Paṇḍita, Ed. by P.B. Annangarācārya Svāmin, Granthamāla Office, Kāñcī, 1953.

DEŚIKASTOTRAMĀLĀ : Stotra-s of Vedānta Deśika with a Tamil commentary by V.N. Śrīrāma Deśikācārya, Pub. R. Rangaswamy, Tanjore, 1966.

DHVANYĀLOKA : of Ānandavardhana with the commentary Dīdhiti, Haridas Sanskrit Granthamālā (66), Benaras, 1953.

NAYADYUMAṆI : of Meghanādārisūri, Ed. by Pandit V. Krishnamacharya and Uttamur T. Viraraghavacharya, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, 1956.

NITYĀNUSANDHEYA STOTRAMĀLĀ : with P.B. Annaṅgarāchārya's Tamil commentary, Pub. K. Tiruvenkatachari, Kāñcī, 1950.

NYĀYAPARIŚUDDHI : of Vedānta Deśika with commentary Nyāyasāra, Pub. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1923.

NYĀYASIDDHĀÑJANA : of Vedānta Deśika with Hindhi translation by Pandit Nilameghāchārya, Ed. Baladeva Upādhyāya, Varanaseya Sanskrit Vidyālaya, Varanasi, 1966.

NYĀYASŪTRA : of Gotama with English translation, The Sacred Books of the Hindus, Vol.III, Allahabad, 1913.

PĀÑCASTAVA : of Kūrattāḷvān, Ed with Tamil commentary by P.B. Annaṅgarācārya Svāmin, Granthamāla Office,

PŪRVAMĪMĀṀSĀ : of Jaimini with Śabarasvāmin's commentary in 2 volumes, Kasi Sanskrit Series No. 42

PRATĀPARUDRĪYA : of Vidyānātha with commentary Ratnāpana, Pub: Sri Balamanorama Press, Madras, 1931.

PRAPANNĀMṚTA : of Anantācārya, Lakshmi Venkateswara Press, Bombay, 1925.

BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀBHĀṢYA: (i) of Śrī Rāmānuja with commentary Tātparya-candrikā of Vedānta Deśika. Pub. Vedānta Deśika Granthamālā Vyākhyāna Section. Vol. II. Kāñcī, 1941.

(ii) Translated into English by Prof. M.R. Sampath kumaran, Madras, 1969.

BHAGAVADGUṆA DARPAṆA : See under ŚRĪVIṢṆU SAHASRANĀMABHĀṢYA

MAHĀBHĀRATA (Vol. I) : Ed. by. T.R. Kṛṣṇācārya and T.R. Vyāsācārya, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1980.

YATĪNDRAMATADĪPIKĀ : of Śrīnivāsadāsa with English translation, Ramakrishna Math, Madras, 1978.

YĀJÑAVALKYASMṚTI : with two commentaries, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series No.62, Benaras.

YĀDAVĀBHYUDAYA (Vol. I) : of Vedānta Deśika, Srirangam Vani Vilas Series (4), Trichy, 1907.

YOGADARŚANA : of Patañjali with two Sanskrit commentaries, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1917.

RĀMĀYAṆA : MLJ Press Ltd. Madras, 1958.

VIṢṆUPURĀṆA : Ed. by Jīvānanda, Calcutta.

VEDĀNTAPARIBHĀṢA : of Dharmarājādhvarindra with a Sanskrit commentary by Pāñcānana Bhaṭṭācārya, Calcutta.

VEDĀRTHSAṄGRAHA : of Śrī Rāmānuja with English translation by S.S. Raghavachar Advaik Ashrama, Mysore, 1978.

ŚARAṆĀGATIGADYA : See under GADYATRAYA

ŚRĪGUṆARATNAKOŚA : of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa with the Tamil commentary by P.B. Annangarācārya Svāmin, Pub. S. Rangaswami Aiyangar, Kumbakonam, 1954.

ŚRĪBHĀṢYA : of Śrī Rāmānuja Pub. (i) Dhaniram Śāstri,

(ii) with the commentary Śrutaprakāśika (in 2 volumes), Ed. by Uttamur T. Viraragavacharya, Madras, 1967.

ŚRĪRAṄGANĀTHA STOTRA : See under NITYĀNUSANDHEYA STOTRAMĀLĀ

ŚRĪRAṄGAMAHĀTMYA : Pub. Krishna Aiyangar, Triśirapuram, (Trichy), 1908.

ŚRĪRAṄGARAJASTAVA : of Parāśara Bhaṭṭa; Pūrva and Uttaraśatakas with Tamil commentary by P.B. Aṇangaracārya Svāmin, Kāñcīpuram, 1913 and 1914.

ŚRĪVACANABHŪṢAṆA : of Pillai Lokācārya Ed. by B.R. Purushottama Naidu, Cuddalore, 1970.

ŚRĪVIṢṆUSAHASRANĀMA STOTRA- BHĀṢYA : (i) of Paraśarabhaṭṭa known as Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa Ed. by A. Srinivasaraghavan, Pub. The Viśiṣṭádvaita Pracharani Sabha, Madras, 1983.

(ii) of Śaṅkara, Pub: Śaṅkarācārya Granthāvali, Vol. IV. Ed. by H.R. Bhagavat, pub. Ashtekar and Co., poona, 1925.

ŚRĪVENKAṬEŚAPRAPATTI : Pub. Lalaji Damodardass, Venkatesvara Yantralaya, Bombay, 1944.

ŚRĪSUKTABHĀṢYA : of Nanjiyar, Ed & Pub. along with several hymns of Sri A. Srinivasaraghavan, Pudukkottai, 1937.

LOKAVĀRTIKA : of Kumārila with commentary Nyāyaratnākara, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, No. 3, 1895.

ĀṄKHYAKĀRIKĀ : of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with Sāṅkhya tattvakaumudī, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1940.

IDDHĀNTAKAUMUDI : with English translation by S.C. Vasu, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1966.

IDDHITRAYA : of Yāmunācārya; contains Ātmasiddhi, Īśvarsiddhi and Saṁvitsiddhi with a Sanskrit commentary by P.B. Annangaracharya of Vadtal. Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1954.

UBHĀṢITATRIŚATI : of Bhartṛhari, Ed. B.B. Kosambi, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1957.

SEŚVARAMĪMĀṀSĀ : of Vedānta Deśika Ed. by P.B. Annaṅgarācārya Svāmin, Vedānta Deśika Granthamāla, Vol. II, Pub. A. Sampathkumaracarya, Kāñcī, 1940.

STOTRARATNA : of Yāmunācārya, Ed. by P.B. Annaṅgarācārya, Vedānta Deśika Granthamāla, Vyākhyāna section, Kāñcī, 1940.

WORKS IN ENGLISH:

AN ANTHOLOGY OF LONGER POEMS : Ed. by T.W. Moles and A.R. Moon, Pub. Longmans Green & Co., Ltd., London, 1967.

CULTURAL HERITAGE OF INDIA (VOL.IV. THE RELIGIOS) : Ed. by Haridas Bhattacharya, Pub. Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, Calcutta, 1969.

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS (VOL.VIII) : by James Hastings, R.T. & T Clark, Edinburg, 1953.

GOD AND UNIVERSE IN THE VEDANTIC THEOLOGY OF RAMANUJA : by Eric J Lott, Pub. Ramanuja Research Society, Madras, 1976.

HISTORY OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY (VOL.III) : by Dr. S.N. Dasgupta, Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, 1975.

IISTORY OF SOUTH NDIA : by K.A. Nilakantha Sastri, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1971.

IISTORY OF RĪVAIṢṆAVAS : by T.A. Gopinatha Rao, Govt. Press, Madras, 1923.

IISTORY OF 'IŚIṢṬĀDVATTA ITERATURE : by Dr. V.K.S.N. Raghavan, Ajantha Publications, Delhi, 1979.

IOYSALA VAṀŚA : by William Coelho, Indian Historical Research Institute, Bombay, 1950.

NDIAN EPHEMERS (A.D. 000 TO 1199) (VOL.III) : by Diwan Bhadur, L.D. Swamikkannu Pillai, Govt. Press, Madras, 1923.

NDIAN PHILOSOPHY VOL.II) : by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, George Allen & Unwin Limited, London, 1927.

NTRODUCTION TO THE 'ĀÑCARĀTRA AND HIRBUDHNYASAṀHITĀ : by F. Otto Schrader, Adyar Library and Research Centre, Madras, 1973 (2nd edn).

IEW CATALOGUS CATALOGORUM (VOL. I & IV) : University of Madras, 1968.

RĪVAIṢṆAVA DIVYADEŚAMS : Compiled by L.V. Gopalan, Viśiṣṭādvaita Prachāriṇī Sabha, Madras, 1972.

/IŚIṢṬĀDVAITA-A : Pub. Rāmānuja Research

YĀMUNA'S CONTRIBUTION TO VIŚIṢṬADVAITA : by Dr. M. Narasimhacharya, Pub. Prof. M. Rangacharya Memorial Trust, Madras, 1917.

WORKS IN GERMAN:

MATERIALIEN ZUR GESCHICHTE DER RĀMĀNUJA - SCHULE: PARĀŚARA BHAṬṬA'S TATTVARATNĀKARAḤ : by Dr. G. Oberhammer, Pub. osterreicchischen Akademie der Wissens-chaften, Wien, 1979.

WORKS IN TAMIL/MAṆIPRAVĀLA:

AITIHYANIRVĀHA RATNAMĀLĀ : Ed. P.B. Annangarācārya Svāmin with his own commentary, pub. Grantha-mālā Office, KāñcīV, 1958.

KAIŚIKAPURĀṆA : of Parāśarabhaṭṭa, pub. Śrīvaiṣṇava Grantha Pracāraṇa Samiti, Trichy, 1973.

GURUPARAMPARĀ PRABHĀVA : of Pinbazhagiyaperumal Jīyar, pub. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar, Trichy, 1975.

TIRUNEḌUNTĀṆṬAKA : of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār with the commentary of Periya Vāccān pillai and Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, Ed. by P.B. Annangarācārya, Kāñcīpuram, 1970.

TIRUVĀYMOZHI : of Nammāḷvār with the commentary Īḍu in ten volumes Ed. by B.P. Puruṣottama Naidu, University of Madras, 1971, 1973 and 1980.

NĀLĀYIRA DIVYAPRABANDHA : of Āḷvārs, pub. T. Gopal & Co, Madras, 1911.

RAHASYATRAYASĀRA : of Vedānta Deśika Ed. by V.N. Śrīrāma Deśikāchārya, Pub. V.R. Ramaswami Aiyangar, Tanjore, 1960.

SILLARAI RAHASYAṄGAL (PART II) : of Vedānta Deśika Ed. by V.N. Śrīrāma Deśikāchārya, pub. V.R. Rangaswami Aiyangar, Tanjore, 1980.

ARTICLES IN JOURNALS:

"AVATARA-S AND YUGA-S : An Essay in Purāṇic Cosmology" by R.M. Huttington, *Purāṇa,* 1914, Vol. IV, No.1, p.13.

"CONTRIBUTION OF TAMILNADU TO SANSKRIT -ŚRIVAIṢṆAVISM" : by Dr. V. Varadachari, *First International Sanskrit Conference,* Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, New Delhi, 1975, Vol. I, Part II, pp.436-463.

"FRAGMENTS FROM NYĀYATATTVA" : K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, G.S. Press, Madras, 1940, pp. 555-578.

'VIŚIṢṬĀDVAITA : Its Mystical and Metaphysical Undertones" by Prof. K. Seshadri, *Reprint from the Journal of Madras University,* Vol. XLIII, No. 1 and 2, Jan-July, 1971.

'VIŚIṢṬĀDVAITA 'HILOSOPHY'' : by Dr. M. narasimhachary, *Percentives of Theism and Absolutism in Indian Philosophy,* Department of Philosophy, Vivekananda College, Madras, 1978. pp.1-22.

'TIRUMAÑJANAKAVI-S" : with Parāśara's own commentary, Vedānta Dīpikā (Ed. by A. Srinivasa Raghavan), pub. Śrīvaiṣṇava Siddhanta Pracara Sabha, Madras, 1938, Vol XVIII, Parts I, III, IV, VIII & IX.

'TIRUMAÑJANAKAVI-S" : with Parāśara's commentary, *Yatirājapādukā,* [Ed. by. R.V. Seshadri], pub. Dr. V.v. Ramanujam, Madras, 1984, Vol. III, Parts 5-8, 10-11, Vol. IV, Parts 1-5.

UNPUBLISHED THESIS:

ŚRĪGUṆARATNAKOŚA : A CRITICAL STUDY WITH THE COMMENTARY OF NĀRĀAṆA, Thesis submitted by S. Padmanabhan for the M. Phil Degree of the University of Madras, 1980.